

## 04. "Introduction" to Lorenzo Lotto, by Bernhard Berenson

Before approaching the first chapter with its dry analysis of data, a bare word of explanation is necessary.

Given a few documentary notices, and a number of pictures, to reconstruct the history of an artist's education, and of the early years of his career — such, at the beginning of our task, is the problem before us.

How shall we solve it ? In one way only, and that is by discovering what habits have become so rooted in the artist as to be unconscious, and under what influences he formed them, the training of the painter being altogether a training in habits of attention, visualisation, and execution.

Of all perceptible phenomena the painter is taught to observe only a few — a certain type of face, let us say, a certain type of figure, a certain type of movement are singled out for observation from among the multiple types existing. Of all possible ways of picturing this type in his memory he is taught but one way, and of all possible ways of transferring his visual image to wall, panel, or canvas he again is taught but one way. He may get more ways later, and even get over his first way, but while fresh from school the young painter's way is sure to be his master's way.

Conclusions, therefore, regarding a painter's origin, drawn from the existence of general resemblances between his works and the works of other masters do not surprise us. We are, however, likely to be troubled by the constant reference to certain details singled out from the many, details apt to be neglected in our general impression of a picture, but pounced upon by recent connoisseurship as likely to yield, the best clue to a master's antecedents.

These details are the ears, the hands, the ringlets of hair, certain constantly recurring bits of landscape, certain awkwardness of attitude, and other such unimportant and even trivial things.

**It is his most enrooted habits;** we bear in mind that the painter acquires from his teacher. What, then, is more likely to reveal habit, the general look of a picture depending so much as it does on the subject, or on the sitter's whim, or the details just enumerated, which the subject scarcely affects, and the sitter never notices ? Let us see in which, habits are most likely to take root.

Habits tend to become fixed in measure as they meet with the least resistance. The child [1] is taught to draw in a stereotyped way, but the habits of execution that he thus tends to form encounter the resistance of the teaching in observation that he is having at the same time. The resistance, however, is not the same all along the line, because attention itself tends to crystallize into habits of regarding certain features and details, and disregarding others. Habits of execution will, therefore, tend to become strongest where habits of attention are weakest.

Now, where are the habits of attention weakest? Surely not in that which is of greatest general human interest, the expression of the human face. Its pleasantness or unpleasantness makes or mars a picture. A habit of execution which resulted in eyes invariably wild, in a mouth invariably sour, in a nose invariably mean, would be fatal to any painter's career ; while the artist who has the wisdom to please in these points, may give the less expressive features any shape, not grotesque, that he chooses. It is in the less expressive features, then, that habits of attention are weakest, and habits of execution, consequently, strongest.

It remains to be seen which features are the less expressive, and therefore the less noticed. They must be those which are less capable of a sudden change of look.

Of all the exposed parts of the human figure, the ears are least capable of sudden change of character.

After the ears come the hands. The ears therefore get the least attention, so little that not one person probably in a thousand knows the shapes either of his own, or of his dearest friend's. Nowadays the hands are noticed, but in the fifteenth century they were scarcely ever observed, and it is only in the sixteenth, that their shape began to glimmer with a suggestion of individuality. The painter's public never noticing them, and consequently never criticising them, there was no reason for doing them otherwise than in the way first learned, and consequently the ears and the hands, more than any other exposed parts, permitted of the formation of habits in their execution. And all that holds true of the ears and hands holds true of even less expressive and less noticed details, as, for instance, hair and dress, regarded not as a whole where they are entirely at the mercy of fashion, but in such details as a particular ringlet, or a particular fold. As long as a painter gives our hair and clothing a certain cut, we do not demand the exact reproduction of every hair and fold. Even if the artist had the patience to reproduce them, we should lack the patience to audit his account. The hair and clothing, then, also permit of the formation of habits in their execution. And we might thus examine every detail of every conceivable picture with figures, to see what chance it gave for the formation of habits of execution; and at the end of our task we should come back to the ears, the hands, the hair, the folds, certain idiosyncrasies of pose, and certain settings and backgrounds, as protest to being executed in a stereotyped fashion.

In other words, the details just mentioned are least liable to change from the way they were done, when first learned. Now, as a master cannot but teach his own ways, those habits of the pupil which, once formed, have undergone the least change can scarcely help being, as much as the pupil's personality will permit, like the master's habits. It follows, therefore, that the ears, the hands, the hair, the drapery, and whatever other details most permit of the formation of habits of execution are the best clue to a painter's origin, and to the history of his novitiate.

I cannot here pursue this subject further. Its full development would take a volume.[2] I must add however that, although habits of execution are the most obvious, they are not necessarily the most tyrannical. Habits of attention, and of visualisation; habits of feeling and of thinking do, no less than habits of execution, intervene between the artist and the object, and all of them the spectator must be able to deduct before he is approximately sure of having before him the idea of the master, and not a projection of his own fancy or fantasy.

With this and with the further word of warning that the artist is not a botanical but a psychological problem, the reader is invited to examine the data upon which rests my theory of Lotto's origin and development.[3]

---

[1] Whatever I say here about the education and the habits of the artist I mean to apply to the Italian artist of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries only. For all I know it may not be true of the artist of to-day.

[2] The author is at present engaged on a work on this subject.

[3] To follow me in my arguments, the reader should have before him the photographs of the various pictures discussed. Photographs of Lotto's works are indicated in the text; of others in an index following after the last chapter.

---

All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval system without a written permission from the editor.

Note: Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders. If any have been inadvertently overlooked the authors will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.



### **03. "Preface" from The History of Painting in Italy, by Luigi Lanzi**

#### Preface [1]

When detached or individual histories become so numerous that they can neither be easily collected nor perused, the public interest requires a writer capable of arranging and embodying them in the form of a general historical narrative; not, indeed, by a minute detail of their whole contents, but by selecting from each that which appears most interesting and instructive. Hence it mostly happens that the diffuse compositions of earlier ages are found to give place to compendiums, and to succinct history. If this desire has prevailed in former times, it has been, and now is, more especially the characteristic of our own. We live in an age highly favourable, in one sense at least, to the cultivation of intellect: the boundaries of science are now extended beyond what our forefathers could have hoped, much less foreseen; and we become anxious only to discover the readiest methods of obtaining a competent knowledge, at least, of several sciences, since it is impossible to acquire them all. On the other hand, the ages preceding ours, since the revival of learning, being more occupied about words than things, and admiring certain objects that now seem trivial to the generality of readers, have produced historical compositions, the separate nature of which demands combination, no less than their prolixity requires abridgment.

If these observations are applicable to other branches of history, they are especially so to the history of painting. Its materials are found ready prepared, scattered through numerous memoirs of artists of every school which, from time to time, have been given to the public: and additional articles are supplied by dictionaries of art, letters on painting, guides to several cities, catalogues of various collections, and by many tracts relating to different artists, which have been published in Italy. But these accounts, independent of want of connexion, are not useful to the generality of readers. Who, indeed, could form a just idea of painting in Italy by perusing the works of certain historians of latter ages, and some even of our own time, which abound in invectives, and in attempts to exalt favourite masters above the artists of all other schools; and which confer eulogies indiscriminately upon professors of first, second, or third-rate merit? [2] How few are there who feel interested in knowing all that is said of artists with so much verbosity by Vasari, Pascoli, or Baldinucci; their low jests, their amours, their private affairs, and their eccentricities? What do we learn by being informed of the jealousies of the Florentine artists, the quarrels of the Roman, or the boasts of the Bolognian schools? Who can endure the verbal accuracy with which their wills and testaments are recorded, even to the subscription of the notary, as if the author had been drawing up a legal document; or the descriptions of their stature and physiognomy, more minute than the ancients afford us of Alexander or Augustus? [3] Not that I object to the introduction of such particulars in the lives of the great luminaries of art: in a Raffaello or a Caracci minute circumstances derive interest from the subject; but how intolerable do they become in the life of an ordinary individual, where the principal incidents are but little interesting? Suetonius has not written the lives of his Cæsars and his grammarians in the same manner: the former he has rendered familiar to the reader; the latter are merely noticed and passed over.

The tastes of individuals, however, are different, and some people delight in minutiae, as it regards both the present and the past; and since it may be of utility to those who may hereafter be inclined to give a very full and perfect history of everything relating to Italian painting, let us view with indulgence those who have employed themselves in compiling lives so copious, and let those who have time to spare, beguile it with their perusal. At the same time, due regard should be paid to that very respectable class of readers, who, in a history of painting, would rather contemplate the artist than the man; and who are less solicitous to become acquainted with the character of a single painter, whose solitary and insulated history cannot prove instructive, than with the genius, the method, the invention, and the style of a great number of artists, with their characteristics, their merits, and their rank, the result of which is a history of the whole art.

To this object there is no one whom I know who has hitherto dedicated his pen, although it seems to be recommended no less by the passion indulged by princes for the fine arts, than by the general diffusion of a knowledge of them among all ranks. The habit of travelling, rendered more familiar to private persons by the example of many great sovereigns, the traffic in pictures, now become a branch of commerce important to Italy, and the philosophic genius of this age, which shuns prolixity in every study, and requires systematic arrangement, are additional incentives to the task. It is true that very pleasing and instructive biographical sketches of the most celebrated painters have been published by M. d'Argenville, in France; and various epitomes have since appeared, in which the style of painting alone is discussed.[4] But without taking into account the corruptions of the names of our countrymen in which their authors have indulged, or their omission of celebrated Italians, while they record less eminent artists of other countries, no work of this sort, and still less any dictionary, can afford us a systematic history of painting: none of these exhibit those pictures, if we may be allowed the expression, in which we may, at a glance, trace the progress and series of events; none of them exhibit the principal masters of the art in a sufficiently conspicuous point of view, while inferior artists are reduced to their proper size and station: far less can we discover in them those epochs and revolutions of the art, which the judicious reader most anxiously desires to know, as the source from which he may trace the causes that have contributed to its revival or its decline; or from which he may be enabled to recollect the series, and the arrangement of the facts narrated. The history of painting has a strong analogy to literary, to civil, and to sacred history; it too requires, from time to time, the aid of certain beacons, some particular distinction in regard to places, times, or events, that may serve to divide it into epochs, and mark its successive stages. Deprive it of these, and it degenerates, like other history, into a chaos of names more calculated to load the memory than to inform the understanding.

To supply this hitherto neglected branch of Italian history, to contribute to the advancement of the art, and to facilitate the study of the different styles in painting, were the three objects I proposed to myself when I began the work which I am now about to lay before the indulgent reader. My intention was to form a compendious history of all our schools, in two volumes; adopting, with little variation, Pliny's division of the country into Upper and Lower Italy. It was my design to comprehend in the first volume the schools of Lower Italy; because in it the reviving arts came earlier to maturity; and in the second to include the schools of Upper Italy, which were more tardy in attaining to celebrity. The first part of my work appeared at Florence in 1792: the second I was obliged to defer to another opportunity, and the succeeding years have so shaken my constitution, that I have scarcely been able to bring it to a conclusion, even with the assistance of many amanuenses and correctors of the press.[5] One advantage, however, has been derived from this delay; and that is, a

knowledge of the opinion of the public, a tribunal from which no writer can appeal; and I have been thus enabled to prepare a new edition conformable to its decision.[6] I have understood through various channels, that an additional number of names and of notices were necessary to afford satisfaction to the public; and this I have accomplished, without abandoning my plan of a compendious history. Nor does the Florentine edition on this account become useless: it will even be preferred by many to that published at Bassano; the inhabitants, for instance, of Lower Italy will be pleased to possess a work on their most illustrious painters, without concerning themselves about accounts of other places.

To a new work, then, so much more extensive than the former, I prefix a preface almost entirely new. The plan is not wholly my own, nor altogether that of others. Richardson [7] suggested that some historian should collect the scattered remarks on art, especially on painting, and should point out its progress and decline through successive ages. He has not even omitted to give us a sketch, which he brought down to the time of Giordano. Mengs [8] accomplished the task more perfectly in the form of a letter, where he judiciously distinguished all the periods of the art, and has thus laid the foundations of a more enlarged history. Were I to follow their example, the chief masters of every school would be considered together, and we should be under the necessity of passing from one country to another, according as painting acquired a new lustre from their talents, or was debased by a wrong use of the great example of those artists. This method might be easily pursued, if the subject were to be treated in a general point of view, such as Pliny has considered and transmitted it to posterity; but it is not equally adapted to the arrangement of a history so fully particular as Italy seems to require. Besides the styles introduced by the most celebrated painters, such infinite diversities of a mixed character, often united with originality of manner, have arisen in every school, that we cannot easily reduce them to any particular standard: and the same artists at different periods, and in different pictures, have adopted styles so various, that at one time they appear imitators of Titian, at another of Raffaello, or of Correggio. We cannot, therefore, adopt the method of the naturalist, who having arranged the vegetable kingdom, for example, in classes more or less numerous, according to the systems of Tournefort or of Linnæus, can easily reduce a plant, wherever it may happen to grow, to a particular class, adding a name and description, at once precise, characteristic, and permanent. In a complete history it is necessary to distinguish each style from every other: nor do I know any more eligible method of performing this task, than by composing a separate history of each school. In this I follow Winckelmann, the best historian of ancient art in design, who specified as many different schools as the nations that produced them. A similar plan seems to me to have been pursued by Rollin, in his *History of Nations*, who has thus been enabled to record a prodigious mass of names and events within the compass of a few volumes, in the clearest order.

The method I follow in treating of each school is analogous to that prescribed to himself by Sig. Antonio Maria Zanetti,[9] in his *Pittura Veneziana*, a work of its kind highly instructive, and well arranged. What he has done, in speaking of his own, I have attempted in the other schools of Italy. I accordingly omit the names of living painters, and do not notice every picture of deceased artists, as it would interrupt the connexion of the narrative, and would render the work too voluminous, but content myself with commending some of their best productions. I first give a general character of each school; I then distinguish it into three, four, or more epochs, according as its style underwent changes with the change of taste, in the same way that the eras of civil history are deduced from revolutions in governments, or other remarkable events. A few celebrated painters, who have swayed the public taste, and given a new tone to the art, are placed at the head of each epoch; and their

style is particularly described, because the general and characteristic taste of the age has been formed upon their models. Their immediate pupils, and other disciples of the school, follow their great masters; and without a repetition of the general character, reference is made to what each has borrowed, altered, or added to the style of the founder of the school, or at most such character is cursorily noticed. This method, though not susceptible of a strict chronological order, is, on account of the connexion of ideas, much better adapted to a history of art than an alphabetic arrangement, which too frequently interrupts the notices of schools and eras; or than the method pursued in annals, by which we are often compelled to make mention of the scholar before the master, should he survive the former; or that of separate lives, which introduces much repetition, by obliging the writer to bestow praises on the pupil for the same style which he also commends in the master, and to notice in each individual that which was the general character of the age in which he lived.

For the sake of perspicuity, I have generally separated from historical painters, artists in inferior branches, such as painters of portraits, of landscape, of animals, of flowers and of fruit, of sea-pieces, of perspectives, of drolls, and all who merit a place in such classes. I have also taken notice of some arts which are analogous to painting, and though they differ from it in the materials employed, or the manner of using them, may still be included in the art; for example, engraving of prints, inlaid and mosaic work, and embroidering tapestry. Vasari, Lomazzo, and several other writers on the fine arts, have mentioned them; and I have followed their example; contenting myself with noticing, in each of those arts, only what has appeared most worthy of being recorded. Each might be the subject of a separate work; and some of them have long had their own peculiar historians, and in particular the art of engraving. By this method, in which I may boast such great examples, I am not without hopes of affording satisfaction to my readers. I am, however, more apprehensive in regard to my selection of artists; the number of whom, whatsoever method is adopted, may to some appear by far too limited, and to others too greatly extended. But criticism will not so readily apply to the names of the most illustrious artists, whom I have included, nor to those of very inferior character, whom I trust I have omitted; except a few that have some claim to be mentioned, from their connexion with celebrated masters.[10] The accusation then of having noticed some, and omitted others, will apply to me only on account of artists of a middle class, that can be neither well reckoned among the senate, the equestrian order, nor vulgar herd of painters; they constitute the class of mediocrity. The adjustment of limits is a frequent cause of legal contention; and the subject of art now under discussion, may be considered like a dispute concerning boundaries. It may often admit of doubt whether a particular artist approaches more nearly to the class of merit or of insignificance; which is, in other words, whether he should or should not obtain a place in a history of the art. Under such uncertainty, which I have several times encountered, I have more usually inclined to the side of lenity than of severity; especially when the artist has been noticed with a degree of commendation by former authors. We ought to bow to public opinion, which rarely blames us for noticing mediocrity, but frequently for passing it over in silence. Books on painting abound with complaints against Orlandi and Guarienti, for their omissions of certain artists. Still more frequently are authors censured, when the Guide to a city points out some altar-piece by a native artist, who is not named in our *Dictionaries of Painting*. The describers of collections repeat similar complaints in regard to every painting bearing the signature of an artist whose name appears in no work of art. Collectors of prints do the same when they discover the name of some designer, of whom history is silent, affixed to an engraving. Thus, were we to consult the opinion of the public, the majority would be inclined to recommend copiousness, rather than to express satisfaction at a more discriminating selection of names. Almost all artists and amateurs belonging to every city, would be desirous that I should commemorate as many of their second rate painters as possible; and our selection, therefore, in this respect, nearly resembles the exercise of

justice, which is generally applauded as long as it visits only the dwellings of others, but is cried down by each individual when it knocks at his own door. Thus a writer who is bound to observe impartiality towards every city, can scarcely shew great severity to artists of mediocrity in any. This too is not without reason; for to pass mediocrity in silence may be the study of a good orator, but not the office of a good historian. Cicero himself, in his treatise *De claris Oratoribus*, has given a place to less eloquent orators, and it may be observed that, after this example, the literary history of every people does not merely include its most classic writers, and those who approached nearest to them; but it adds short and concise accounts of authors less celebrated; and in the Iliad, which is a history of the heroic age, there are a few eminent leaders, many valiant soldiers, and a prodigious crowd of others, whom the poet has transiently noticed. In our case, it is still more incumbent on the historian to give mediocrity a place along with the eminent and most excellent. Many books describe that class in terms so vague, and sometimes so discordant, that to form a proper estimate of their claims, we must introduce them among superior artists, as a sort of performers in third-rate parts. Such, however, I am not solicitous to exhibit very minutely, more especially when treating of painters in fresco, and generally of other artists, whose works are now unknown in collections, or add more to the bulk than the ornament of a gallery. Thus also in point of number, my work has maintained the character of a compendium: but if any of my readers, adopting the rigid maxim of Bellori, that, in the fine arts, as in poetry, mediocrity is not to be tolerated,[11] should disdain the middle class of artists, he must look for the heads of schools, and for the most eminent painters: to these he may dedicate his attention, and turn his regard from the others like one,

"Cui altra cura stringa e morda  
Che quella di colui che gli è davante." [12]

Having described my plan, let us next consider the three objects originally proposed, of which the first was to present Italy with a history that may prove important to her fame. This delightful country is already indebted to Tiraboschi for a history of her literature, but she is still in want of a history of her arts. The history of painting, an art in which she is confessedly without a rival, I propose to supply, or at least to facilitate the attempt. In some departments of literature, and of the fine arts, we are equalled, or even surpassed by foreigners; and in others the palm is yet doubtful: but in painting, universal consent now yields the triumph to Italian genius, and foreigners are the more esteemed in proportion to their approach towards us. It is time then, for the honour of Italy, to collect in one point of view, those observations on her painting, scattered through upwards of a hundred volumes, and to embody them in what Horace terms *series et junctura*; without which the work cannot be pronounced a history. I will not conceal, that the author of the "History of Italian Literature" above mentioned, frequently animated me to this undertaking, as a sequel to his own work. He also wished me to subjoin other anecdotes to those already published, and to substitute more authentic documents for the inaccuracies abounding in our Dictionaries of painting. I have attended to both these objects. The reader will here find various schools never hitherto illustrated, and an entire school, that of Ferrara, now first described from the manuscripts of Baruffaldi and of Crespi; and in other schools he will often observe names of fresh artists, which I have either collected from ancient MSS.[13] and the correspondence of my learned friends, or deciphered on old paintings. Although such pictures are confined to cabinets, it cannot prove useless to extend a more intimate acquaintance with their authors. The reader will also meet with many new observations on the origin of painting, and on its diffusion in Italy, formerly a fruitful subject of debate and contention; and likewise here and there with some original reflections on the masters, to whom various disciples may be traced; a branch of history, the most uncertain of any. Old writers of respectability often



mention Raffaello, Correggio, or some other celebrated artist, as the master of a painter, without any better foundation than a similarity of style; just as the credulous heathens imagined one hero to be the son of Hercules, because he was strong; another of Mercury, because he was ingenious; a third of Neptune, because he had performed several long voyages. Errors like these are easily corrected when they are accompanied by some inadvertency in the writer; as for instance, where he has not been aware that the age of the disciple does not correspond with that of his supposed master. Occasionally, however, their detection is attended with more difficulty; and in particular when the artist, whose reputation is wholly founded upon that of his master, represented himself in foreign parts, as the disciple of men of celebrity, whom he scarcely knew by sight. Of this we have an example in Agostino Tassi, and more recently in certain soidisant disciples of Mengs; to whom it scarcely appears that he ever so much as said, "Gentlemen, how do you do?"

Finally, the reader will find some less obvious notices relating to the name, the country, and the age of different artists. The deficiency of our *Dictionaries* in interesting names, together with their inaccuracy, are common subjects of complaint. I can excuse the compilers of these works; I know how easily we may be misled in regard to names which have been often gathered from vulgar report, or even from authors who differ in point of orthography, some giving opposite readings of the same name. But it is quite necessary that such mistakes should once for all be cleared up. The index of this work will form a new Dictionary of Painters, certainly more copious, and perhaps more accurate than usual, although it might be still further improved, especially by consulting archives and manuscripts.[14]

The second object which I had in view was to advance the interests of the art as much as lay in my power. It was of old observed that examples have a more powerful influence on the arts than any precepts can possess; and this is particularly true in respect to painting. Whoever writes history upon the model of the learned ancients, ought not only to narrate events, but to investigate their secret sources and their causes. Now these will be here developed, tracing the progress of painting as it advanced or declined in each school; and these causes being invariable, point out the means of its improvement, by shewing what ought to be pursued and what avoided. Such observations are not of importance to the artist alone, but have a reference also to other individuals. In the Roman school, during its second epoch, I perceive that the progress of the arts invariably depends on certain principles universally adopted in that age, according to which artists worked, and the public decided. A general history, by pointing out the best maxims of art, may contribute considerably to make them known and regarded; and hence artists can execute, and others approve or direct, on principles no longer uncertain and questionable, nor deduced from the manner of a particular school, but founded on maxims unerring and established, and strengthened by the uniform practice of all schools and all ages. We may add, that in a history so diversified, numerous examples occur suited to the genius of different students, who have often to lament their want of success from this circumstance alone, that they had neglected to follow the path in which nature had destined them to tread. On the influence of examples I shall add no more: should anyone be desirous also of precepts under every school, he will find them given, not indeed by me, but by those who have written more ably on the art, and whom I have diligently consulted with regard to different masters, as I shall hereafter mention.

My third object was to facilitate an acquaintance with the various styles of painting. The

artist or amateur indeed, who has studied the manner of all ages and of every school, on meeting with a picture can very readily assign it, if not to a particular master, at least to a certain style, much as antiquarians, from a consideration of the paper and the characters, are enabled to assign a manuscript to a particular era; or as critics conjecture the age and place in which an anonymous author flourished, from his phraseology. With similar lights we proceed to investigate the school and era of artists; and by a diligent examination of prints, drawings, and other relics belonging to the period, we at length determine the real author. Much of the uncertainty, with regard to pictures, arises from a similitude between the style of different masters: these I collect together under one head, and remark in what one differs from the other. Ambiguity often arises from comparing different works of the same painter, when the style of some of them does not seem to accord with his general manner, nor with the great reputation he may have acquired. On account of such uncertainty, I usually point out the master of each artist, because all at the outset imitate the example offered by their teachers; and I, moreover, note the style formed, and adhered to by each, or abandoned for another manner; I sometimes mark the age in which he lived, and his greater or less assiduity in his profession. By an attentive consideration of such circumstances, we may avoid pronouncing a picture spurious, which may have been painted in old age, or negligently executed. Who, for instance, would receive as genuine all the pictures of Guido, were it not known that he sometimes affected the style of Caracci, of Calvart, or of Caravaggio; and at other times pursued a manner of his own, in which, however, he was often very unequal, as he is known to have painted three or four different pieces in a single day? Who would suppose that the works of Giordano were the production of the same artist, if it were not known that he aspired to diversify his style, by adopting the manner of various ancient artists? These are indeed well known facts, but how many are there yet unnoted that are not unworthy of being related, if we wish to avoid falling into error? Such will be found noticed in my work, among other anecdotes of the various masters, and the different styles.

I am aware that to become critically acquainted with the diversity of styles is not the ultimate object to which the travels and the eager solicitude of the connoisseur aspire. His object is to make himself familiar with the handling of the most celebrated masters, and to distinguish copies from originals. Happy should I be, could I promise to accomplish so much! Even they might consider themselves fortunate, who dedicate their lives to such pursuits, were they enabled to discover any short, general, and certain rules for infallibly determining this delicate point! Many rely much upon history for the truth. But how frequently does it happen that the authority of an historian is cited in favour of a family picture, or an altar-piece, the original of which having been disposed of by some of the predecessors, and a copy substituted in its place, the latter is supposed to be a genuine painting! Others seem to lay great stress on the importance of places, and hesitate to raise doubts respecting any specimen they find contained in royal and select galleries, assuming that they really belong to the artists referred to in the gallery descriptions and catalogues. But here too they are liable to mistake; inasmuch as many private individuals, as well as princes, unable to purchase ancient pictures at any price, contented themselves with such copies of their imitators as approached nearest to the old masters. Some indeed were made by professors purposely despatched by princes in search of them; as in the instance of Rodolph I., who employed Giuseppe Enzo, a celebrated copyist. (See Boschini, p. 62, and Orlandi, on Gioseffo Ains di Berna.) External proofs, therefore, are insufficient, without adding a knowledge of different manners. The acquisition of such discrimination is the fruit only of long experience, and deep reflection on the style of each master: and I shall endeavour to point out the manner in which it may be obtained.[15]

To judge of a master we must attend to his design, and this is to be acquired from his drawings, from his pictures, or, at least, from accurate engravings after them. A good connoisseur in prints is more than half way advanced in the art of judging pictures; and he who aims at this must study engravings with unremitting assiduity. It is thus his eye becomes familiarized to the artist's method of delineating and foreshortening the figure, to the air of his heads and the casting of his draperies; to that action, that peculiarity of conception, of disposing, and of contrasting, which are habitual to his character. Thus is he, as it were, introduced to the different families of youths, of children, of women, of old men, and of individuals in the vigour of life, which each artist has adopted as his own, and has usually exhibited in his pictures. We cannot be too well versed in such matters, so minute or almost insensible are the distinctions between the imitators of one master, (such as Michelangiolo, for example,) who have perhaps studied the same cartoon, or the same statues, and, as it were, learned to write after the same model.

More originality is generally to be discovered in colouring, a branch of the art formed by a painter rather on his own judgment, than by instruction. The amateur can never attain experience in this branch who has not studied many pictures by the same master; who has not observed his selection of colours, his method of separating, of uniting, and of subduing them; what are his local tints, and what the general tone that harmonizes the colours he employs. This tint, however clear and silvery in Guido and his followers, bright and golden in Titiano and his school, and thus of the rest, has still as many modifications as there are masters in the art. The same remark extends to middle tints and to chiaroscuro, in which each artist employs a peculiar method.

These are qualities which catch the eye at a distance, yet they will not always enable the critic to decide with certainty; whether, for instance, a certain picture is the production of Vinci, or Luini, who imitated him closely; whether another be an original picture by Barocci, or an exact copy from the hand of Vanni. In such cases judges of art approach closer to the picture with a determination to examine it with the same care and accuracy as are employed in a judicial question, upon the recognition of hand-writing. Fortunately for society, nature has granted to every individual a peculiar character in this respect, which it is not easy to counterfeit, nor to mistake for any other person's writing. The hand, habituated to move in a peculiar manner, always retains it: in old age the characters may be more slowly traced, may become more negligent or more heavy; but the form of the letters remains the same. So it is in painting. Every artist not only retains this peculiarity, but one is distinguished by a full charged pencil; another by a dry but neat finish; the work of one exhibits blended tints, that of another distinct touches; and each has his own manner of laying on the colours:[16] but even in regard to what is common to so many, each has a peculiar handling and direction of the pencil, a marking of his lines more or less waved, more or less free, and more or less studied, by which those truly skilled from long experience are enabled, after a due consideration of all circumstances, to decide who was the real author. Such judges do not fear a copyist, however excellent. He will, perhaps, keep pace with his model for a certain time, but not always; he may sometimes shew a free, but commonly a timid, servile, and meagre pencil; he will not be long able, with a free hand, to keep his own style concealed under the manner of another, more especially in regard to less important points, such as the penciling of the hair, and in the fore- and back-grounds of the picture.[17] Certain observations on the canvas and the priming ground may sometimes assist inquiry; and hence some have endeavoured to attain greater certainty by a chemical analysis of the colours. Diligence is ever laudable when exerted on a point so nice as ascertaining the hand-work of a celebrated master. It may prevent our paying ten guineas for

what may not be worth two; or placing in a choice collection pictures that will not do it credit; while to the curious it affords scientific views, instead of creating prejudices that often engender errors. That mistakes should happen is not surprising. A true connoisseur is still more rare than a good artist. His skill is the result of only indirect application; it is acquired amidst other pursuits, and divides the attention with other objects; the means of attaining it fall to the lot of few; and still fewer practise it successfully. Among the number of the last I do not reckon myself. By this work I pretend not, I repeat it, to form an accomplished connoisseur in painting: my object is to facilitate and expedite the acquisition of such knowledge. The history of painting is the basis of connoisseurship; by combining it, I supersede the necessity of referring to many books; by abbreviating it I save the time and labour of the student; and by arranging it in a proper manner on every occasion, I present him with the subject ready prepared and developed before him.

It remains, in the last place, that I should give some account of myself; of the criticisms that I, who am not an artist, have ventured to pass upon each painter: and, indeed, if the professors of the art had as much leisure and experience in writing as they have ability, every author might resign to them the field. The propriety of technical terms, the abilities of artists, and the selection of specimens of art, are usually better understood, even by an indifferent artist, than by the learned connoisseur: but since those occupied in painting have not sufficient leisure to write, others, assisted by them, may be permitted to undertake the office.[18]

By the mutual assistance which the painter has afforded to the man of letters, and the man of letters to the artist, the history of painting has been greatly advanced. The merits of the best painters are already so ably discussed that a modern historian can treat the subject advantageously. The criticisms I most regard are those that come directly from professors of the art. We meet with few from the pen of Raphael, of Titian, of Poussin, and of other great masters; such as exist, however, I regard as most precious, and deserving the most careful preservation; for, in general, those who can best perform can likewise judge the best. Vasari, Lomazzo, Passeri, Ridolfi, Boschini, Zanotti, and Crespi, require, perhaps, to be narrowly watched in some passages where they allowed themselves to be surprised by a spirit of party: but, on the whole, they have an undoubted right to dictate to us, because they were themselves painters. Bellori, Baldinucci, Count Malvasia, Count Tassi, and similar writers, hold an inferior rank; but are not wholly destitute of authority: for though mere dilettanti, they have collected both the opinions of professors and of the public. This will at present suffice, with regard to the historians of the art: we shall notice each of them particularly under the school which he has described.

In pronouncing a criticism upon each artist I have adopted the plan of Baillet, the author of a voluminous history of works on taste, where he does not so frequently give his own opinion as that of others. Accordingly, I have collected the various remarks of connoisseurs, which were scattered through the pages of history; but I have not always cited my authorities, lest I should add too much to the dimensions of my book;[19] nor have I regarded their opinion when they seemed to me to have been influenced by prejudice. I have availed myself of the observations of some approved critics, like Borghini, Fresnoy, Richardson, Bottari, Algarotti, Lazzarini, and Mengs; with others who have rather criticised our painters than written their lives. I have also respected the opinions of living critics, by consulting different professors in Italy: to them I have submitted my manuscript; I have followed their

advice, especially when it related to design, or any other department of painting, in which artists are almost the only adequate judges. I have conversed with many connoisseurs, who, in some points, are not less skilful than the professors of the art, and are even consulted by artists with advantage; as, for instance, on the suitableness of the subject, on the propriety of the invention and the expression, on the imitation of the antique, on the truth of the colouring. Nor have I failed to study the greatest part of the best productions of the schools of Italy; and to inform myself in the different cities what rank their least known painters hold among their connoisseurs; persuaded, as I am, that the most accurate opinion of any artist is formed where the greatest number of his works are to be seen, and where he is most frequently spoken of by his fellow citizens and by strangers. In this way, also, I have been enabled to do justice to the merits of several artists who had been passed over, either because the historian of their school had never beheld their productions, or had merely met with some early and trivial specimens in one city, being unacquainted with the more perfect and mature specimens they had produced elsewhere.

Notwithstanding my diligence I do not presume to offer this as a work to which much might not be added. It has never happened that a history, embracing so many objects, is at once produced perfect; though it may gradually be rendered so. The history earliest in point of time, becomes, in the end, the least in authority; and its greatest merit is in having paved the way to more finished performances. Perfection is still less to be expected in a compendium. The reader is here presented with the names of many artists and authors; but many others might have been admitted, whom want of leisure or opportunity, but not of respect, has obliged us to omit. Here he will find a variety of opinions; but to these many others might have been added. There is no man, of whom all think alike. Baillet, just before mentioned, is a proof of this, with regard to writers on literary subjects; and he who thinks the task worthy of his pains might demonstrate it much more fully with respect to different painters. Each judges by principles peculiar to himself: Bonarruoti stigmatized as drivelling, Pietro Perugino and Francia, both luminaries of the art; Guido, if we may credit history, was disapproved of by Cortona; Caravaggio by Zuccheri; Guercino by Guido; and, what seems more extraordinary, Domenichino by most of the artists who flourished at Rome, when he painted his finest pictures.[20] Had these artists written of their rivals they either would have condemned them, or spoken less favourably of them than unprejudiced individuals. Hence it is that connoisseurs will frequently be found to approach nearer the truth, in forming their estimate, than artists; the former adopt the impartial feelings of the public, while the latter allow themselves to be influenced by motives of envy or of prejudice. Innumerable similar disputes are still maintained concerning several artists, who, like different kinds of aliment, are found to be disagreeable or grateful to different palates. To hold the happy mean, exempted from all party spirit, is as impossible as to reconcile the opinions of mankind, which are as multifarious as are the individuals of the species.

Amid such discrepancy of opinion I have judged it expedient to avoid the most controverted points; in others, to subscribe to the decision of the majority; to allow to each his particular opinion;[21] but not, if possible, to disappoint the reader, desirous of learning what is most authentic and generally received. Ancient writers appear to have pursued this plan when treating of the professors of any art, in which they themselves were mere amateurs; nor could it arise from any other circumstance that Cicero, Pliny, and Quintilian, express themselves upon the Greek artists in the same manner. Their opinions coincide, because that of the public was unanimous. I am aware that it is difficult to obtain the opinion of the public concerning the more modern artists, but it is not difficult with regard to those on whom much has been already written. I am also aware that public opinion accords not at all

times with truth, because "it often happens to incline to the wrong side of the question." This, however, is a rare occurrence in the fine arts,[22] nor does it militate against an historian who aims more at fidelity of narrative, and impartiality of public opinion, than the discussion of the relative merit or correctness of tastes.

My work is divided into six volumes; and I commence by treating in the two first volumes of that part of Italy, which, through the genius of Da Vinci, Michelangiolo, and Raffaello, became first conspicuous, and first exhibited a decided character in painting. Those artists were the ornaments of the Florentine and Roman schools, from which I proceed to two others, the Sienese and Neapolitan. About the same time Giorgione, Tiziano, and Coreggio, began to flourish in Italy; three artists, who as much advanced the art of colouring, as the former improved design; and of these luminaries of Upper Italy I treat in the third and fourth volumes; since the number of the names of artists, and the many additions to this new impression, have induced me to devote two volumes to their merits. Then follows the school of Bologna, in which the attempt was made to unite the excellences of all the other schools: this commences the fifth volume; and on account of proximity it is succeeded by that of Ferrara, and Upper and Lower Romagna. The school of Genoa, which was late in acquiring celebrity, succeeds, and we conclude with that of Piedmont, which, though it cannot boast so long a succession of artists as those of the other states, has merits sufficient to entitle it to a place in a history of painting. Thus the five most celebrated schools will be treated of in the order in which they arose; in like manner as the ancient writers on painting began with the Asiatic school, which was followed by the Grecian, and this last was subdivided into the Attic and Sicyonian; to which in process of time succeeded the Roman school.[23] The sixth and last volume contains an ample index to the whole, quite indispensable to render the work more extensively useful, and to give it its full advantage. In assigning artists to any school I have paid more regard to other circumstances than the place of their nativity; to their education, their style, their place of residence in particular, and the instruction of their pupils: circumstances, indeed, which are sometimes found so blended and confused, that several cities may contend for one painter, as they are said to have done for Homer. In such cases I do not pretend to decide; the object of my labours being only to trace the vicissitudes of the art in various places, and to point out those artists who have exercised an influence over them; not to determine disputes, unpleasant in themselves, and wholly foreign to my undertaking.

---

[1] Luigi Antonio Lanzi "Preface", *The History of Painting in Italy, Vol. I, From the Period of the Revival of the Fine Arts to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, translated by Thomas Roscoe (1828), London: W. Simpkin and R. Marshall.

[2] See Algarotti, *Saggio sopra la Pittura*, in the chapter Della critica necessaria al Pittore.

[3] For this fault, which the Greeks used to call Acribia, Pascoli has been sharply reproofed. He has, in fact, informed us which among the several artists could boast a becoming and proportionate nose, which had it short or long, aquiline or snubbed, very sharp or very hollow. He most generally observes that such an artist was neither tall nor large of stature, neither handsome nor plain in his physiognomy; and who would have thought it worth his while to inquire about it? The sole utility that can possibly attend such inquiries is, the chance of detecting some impostor, who might attempt to palm upon us for a genuine portrait the likeness of some other individual. Engravings, however, are the best security against similar impositions.

[4] In the *Magasin Encyclopédique* of Paris, (An. viii. tom. iv. p. 63), there is a work in two volumes, edited in the German language at Gottingen, announced as well as commended. The first volume is dated 1798, the second 1801, from the pen of note the learned Sig. Florillo, the title of which we insert in the second index. It consists of a history of painting upon the plan of the present one; but there is some variation in the order of the schools.

[5] It was finished in the year 1796, and it is now given, with various additions and corrections throughout. Many churches, galleries, and pictures, are here mentioned which are no longer in existence; but this does not interfere with its truth, inasmuch as the title of the work is confined to the before mentioned year. Numerous friends have lent me their assistance in the completion of this edition, and in particular the cavalier Gio. de' Lazara, a gentleman of Padua, who possesses a rich collection, both in books and MSS., and displays the utmost liberality in affording others the use of them. To this merit, in regard to the present work, he has likewise added that of revising and correcting it through the press, a favour which I could not have more highly estimated from any other hand, deeply versed as he is in the history of the fine arts.

[6] "Ut enim pictores, et qui signa faciunt, et vero etiam poetæ suum quisque opus à vulgo considerari vult, ut si quid reprehensum sit à pluribus id corrigatur ... sic aliorum judicio permulta nobis et facienda et non facienda, et mutanda et corrigenda sunt." Cicero *De Officiis*, ii. c. 41.

[7] *Treatise on Painting*, tom. ii. p. 166.

[8] *Opere*, tom. ii. p. 108

[9] A learned Venetian, skilled in the practice of design and of painting. He must not be confounded with Antonio Maria Zanetti, an eminent engraver, who revived the art of taking prints from wooden blocks with more than one colour, which was invented by Ugo da Carpi, but afterwards lost. He also wrote works, serviceable to the fine arts; and several of his letters may be seen in the second volume of *Lettere Pittoriche*. They are subscribed Antonio Maria Zanetti, q. Erasmo; but this is an error of the editor: it ought to be q. Girolamo, to distinguish him from the other, who was called del q. Alessandro. This mistake was detected by the accurate Vianelli, in his *Diario della Carriera*, p. 49.

[10] An amateur, who happens to be unacquainted with the fact, that there were various artists of the same name, as the Vecelli, Bassani, and Caracci, will never become properly acquainted with these families of painters; neither will he be competent to judge of certain pictures, which only attract the regard of the vulgar, because they truly boast the reputation of a great name.

[11] I do not admit this principle. Horace laid it down for the art of poetry alone, because it is a faculty that perishes when it ceases to give delight. Architecture, on the other hand, confers vast utility when it does not please, by presenting us with habitations; and painting, and sculpture, by preserving the features of men, and illustrious actions. Besides, let us recollect, that Horace denounces the production of inferior verses, because there is not space enough for them; "Non concessere columnæ," but it is not so with paintings of mediocrity. In any country Petrarch, Ariosto, and Tasso, may be read, and he who has never read a poor poet, will write better than if he had read a hundred. But it is not every one who can boast either in the houses or temples of his country, of possessing the works of good artists; and for purposes of worship or of ornament, the less excellent ones may suffice; wherefore these also produce some advantage.

[12] Like one who thinks of some other person than he that is before him.

[13] For the improvement of my latest edition, I am greatly indebted to the Prince Filippo Ercolani, who, having purchased from the heirs of Signor Marcello Oretti fifty-two manuscript volumes, which that indefatigable amateur, in the course of his studies, journeys, and observations, had compiled respecting the professors of the fine arts, their eras, and their labours, allowed materials to be drawn from them for various notes, by the Sig. Lazara, who superintended the edition. To the devoted attachment of these gentlemen to the fine arts, the public are indebted for much information, either wholly new, or hitherto little known.

[14] Vasari, from whom several epochs are taken, is full of errors in dates, as may be everywhere perceived. See Bottari's note on tom. ii. p. 79. The same observation applies generally to other authors, as Bottari remarks in a note on *Lettere Pittoriche*, tom. iv. p. 366. A similar objection is made to the *Dictionary* of P. Orlandi in another letter, tom. ii. p. 318, where it is termed "a useful work, but so full of errors, that one can derive no benefit from it without possessing the books there quoted." After three editions of this work, a fourth was printed in Venice, in 1753, corrected and enlarged by Guarienti, "but enough still remains to be done after his additions, even to increase it twofold." Bottari, *Lett. Pitt.* tom. iii. p. 353. See also Crespi *Vite de' Pittori Bolognesi*, p. 50. No one, who has not perused this book, would believe how often he defaces Orlandi in presuming to correct him; multiplying artists for every little difference with which authors wrote the name of the same man. Thus Pier Antonio Torre, and Antonio Torri, are with him two different men. Many of the articles, however, added by him, relating to artists unknown to P. Orlandi, are useful; so that this second Dictionary ought to be consulted with caution, not altogether rejected. The last edition, printed at Florence, in two volumes, contains the names of many painters, either lately dead, or still living, and often of very inferior merit, and on this account is little noticed in my history. This Dictionary, moreover, affords little satisfaction to the reader concerning the old masters, unless he possess a work printed at Florence in twelve volumes, entitled *Serie degli Uomini più illustri in Pittura*, to which the articles in it often refer. The *Dizionario Portatile*, by Mr. La Combe, is also a book of reference, not very valuable to those who look for exact information. We give a single instance of his inaccuracy in regard to the elder Palma; but our emendations have been chiefly directed towards the writers of Italy, from whom foreigners have, or ought to have borrowed, in writing respecting our artists.

[15] See Mr. *Richardson's Treatise on Painting*, tom. ii. p. 58; and M. D'Argenville's *Abrégé de la Vie des plus fameux Peintres*, tom. i. p. 65.

[16] "Some made use of pure colours, without blending one with the other; a practice well understood in the age of Titiano: others, as Coreggio, adopted a method totally opposite: he laid on his admirable colours in such a manner, that they appear as if they had been breathed without effort on the canvas; so soft and so clear, without harshness of outline, and so relieved, that he seems the rival of nature. The elder Palma and Lorenzo Lotto coloured freshly, and finished their pictures as highly as Giovanni Bellini; but they have loaded and overwhelmed them with outline and softness in the style of Titiano and Giorgione. Some others, as Tintoretto, to a purity of colour not inferior to the artists above mentioned, have added a boldness as grand as it is astonishing;" &c. Baldinucci, *Lett. Pittor.* tom. ii. lett. 126.

[17] See Baldinucci in *Lett. Pittor.* tom. ii. lett. 126, and one by Crespi, tom. iv. lett. 162.

[18] We must recollect that "de pictore, sculptore, fusore, judicare nisi artifex non potest," (*Plin. Jun.* i. epist. 10); which must be understood of certain refinements of the art that may escape the eye of the most learned connoisseur. But have we any need of a painter to whisper in our ear whether the features of a figure are handsome or ugly, its colouring false or natural, whether it has harmony and expression, or whether its composition be in the



Roman or Venetian taste? And where it is really expedient to have the opinion of an artist, which we therefore report as we have either read it or heard it, will that opinion have less authority in my pages than on his own tongue?

[19] Abundance of quotations, and descriptions of the minutest particulars from rarer works is a characteristic of the present day, to which I think I have sufficiently conformed in my second Index. But in a history expressly composed to instruct and please, I have judged it right not to interrupt the thread of the narrative too frequently with different authorities. The works from which I draw my account of each artist are indicated in the body of the history and in the first index: to make continual allusion to them might please a few, but would prove very disagreeable to many.

[20] Pietro da Cortona told Falconieri that when the celebrated picture of S. Girolamo della Carità was exhibited, "it was so abused by all the eminent painters, of whom many then flourished, that he himself joined in its condemnation, in order to save his credit." See Falconieri, *Lett. Pittor.* tom. ii. lett. 17. He continues: "Is not the tribune of the church of S. Andrea della Valle, ornamented by Domenichino, among the finest specimens of painting in fresco? and yet they talked of sending masons with hammers to knock it down after he had displayed it. When Domenichino afterwards passed through the church, he stopped with his scholars to view it; and, shrugging up his shoulders, observed, 'After all, I do not think the picture so badly executed.'"

[21] The most singular and novel opinions concerning our painters are contained in the volumes published by M. Cochin, who is confuted in the Guides to the cities of Padua and Parma, and is often convicted of erroneous statements in matter of fact. He is reprov'd, with regard to Bologna, by Crespi, in *Lett. Pittor.* tom. vii.; and for what he has said of Genoa, by Ratti, in the lives of the painters of that city. Commencing with his preface, they point out the grossest errors in Cochin. It is there also observed that his work was disapproved of by Watellet, by Clerisseau, and other French connoisseurs then living: nor do I believe it would have pleased Filibien, De Piles, and such masters of the critical art. Italy also, at a later period, has produced a book, which aims at overturning the received opinions on subjects connected with the fine arts. It is entitled *Arte di vedere secondo i principii di Sulzer e di Mengs*. The author, who in certain periodical works at Rome, was called the modern Diogenes, has been honoured with various confutations. (See *Lettera in Difesa del Cav. Ratti*, p. 11.) Authors like these launch their extravagant opinions, for the purpose of attracting the gaze of the world; but men of letters, if they cannot pass them over in silence, ought not to be very anxious to gratify their wishes—"Opinionum commenta delet dies." Cicero.

[22] Of Apelles himself Pliny observes, "Vulgum diligentiorē judicem quam se praeferens." Examine also Carlo Dati in *Vite de' Pittori Antichi*, p. 99, where he proves, by authority and examples, that judgment, in the imitative arts, is not confined to the learned. See also Junius, *De Pictura Veterum*, lib. i. cap.5.

[23] See Mons. Agucchi, in a fragment preserved by Bellori, in *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori, e Architetti moderni*, p. 190.

---

All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval system without a written permission from the editor.

Note: Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders. If any have been

inadvertently overlooked the authors will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.

Updated on Απρ 22, 2012 by [\[no name found\]](#) (Version 13)

## 02. from *The Merchant of Venice* (1596)

**Bas.** What finde I here?  
Faire Portias counterfeit. What demie God  
Hath come so neere creation? moue these eies?  
Or whether riding on the bals of mine  
Seeme they in motion? Here are seuer'd lips  
Parted with suger breath, so sweet a barre  
Should sunder such sweet friends: here in her haires  
The Painter plaies the Spider, and hath wouen  
A golden mesh t' intrap the hearts of men  
Faster then gnats in cobwebs: but her eies,  
How could he see to doe them? hauing made one,  
Me thinkes it should haue power to steale both his  
And leaue it selfe vnfurnisht: Yet looke how farre  
The substance of my praise doth wrong this shadow  
In vnderprising it, so farre this shadow  
Doth limpe behinde the substance. Here's the scroule,  
The continent, and summarie of my fortune.  
You that choose not by the view  
Chance as faire, and choose as true:  
Since this fortune fals to you,  
Be content, and seeke no new.  
If you be well pleasd with this,  
And hold your fortune for your blisse,  
Turne you where your Lady is,  
And claime her with a louing kisse.

William Shakespeare, "The Merchant of Venice, (3.2.125 - 150)", in William Shakespeare, *The complete works*, general editors, Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (1986), Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Updated on Apr 22, 2012 by [\[no name found\]](#) (Version 9)

## 05. "The Academy" from Venice and Venetia, by Edward Hutton

The Academy [1]

**THE Venetian School of Painting** which, with its great masters of the sixteenth century, occupies so famous a place in the history of Art, was not only very much later in its development than any other school in Italy, but was essentially different both in its condition and in its intention from any of them, and may be said to have sprung fully armed into existence in the middle of the fifteenth century really without forbears in Venice, and after a brief but very glorious existence of some two hundred years to have passed away, leaving, however, to such men as Canaletto, Guardi, and Tiepolo a remembrance, a shadow of its glory which remains as a wonderful fterglow, if we may say so, upon their work.

**Unlike the schools of Florence, Siena, and Umbria, the Venetian school** has little fundamentally to do with religion: it is the first, as it is the only, secular school of Italy, and its chief technical characteristic is neither the power and integrity of its drawing, nor its beauty and delight as decoration, but the splendour of its colour, its continual preoccupation with joy and with life.

The school of Florence, the school of Siena early produced each a great master who not only decided the future of painting in both those cities, but in a very real sense summed up in his own achievement what that future was to be. The work of Masaccio, of Michelangelo even, is as implicit in the frescoes of Giotto as the work of Sassetta is in that of Duccio; but there is nothing in the early Venetians that, even in the smallest measure, prophesies the work of Giorgione, of Titian, of Tintoretto. Nor can we assert that Giorgione himself is such a prophecy, and that in the fifteen pictures which we possess from his hand all the work of Titian, of Tintoretto, and Paolo Veronese really lies hid. For each of these men is himself a prophecy which is only fulfilled in the work each accomplished. Giorgione may, it is true, speak for the young Titian; but who but Titian himself may speak for the later periods of his work? Who but Tintoretto prophesied of Tintoretto? And who but Veronese could have imagined the glory that passes under his name? Moreover, if in Giorgione we find indeed the Giotto of the school, what are we to make of his so late appearance in 1478, two hundred years and more after the birth of Giotto and Duccio, and how are we properly to explain his forerunners, the Bellini and Carpaccio, for instance, who, if indeed he is their successor, would have been astonished at their progeny ? For the truth is that Giorgione, Titian, and Tintoretto are each an absolutely new impulse in painting.

Fundamentally they owe nothing, accidentally even very little, to their predecessors ; and if, as we have said, Titian and Tintoretto were able to find full expression because of the work of Giorgione, it is only in the way that Shakespeare and Milton may be said to owe something, though it might be difficult to assert precisely what it is, to Spenser ; what they owe to Chaucer, though doubtless they owe much, it might seem impossible to indicate with any clearness. We may say the same of Venetian painting, which in more ways than one resembles very closely the work of our poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Chaucer's debt to Italy, to Boccaccio, is as great as the debt of the early Venetians to the Byzantine masters ; but the work of Shakespeare, the work of Milton, the work of Giorgione, Titian, and Tintoretto are absolutely new things in the world, the result of a new

impulse and a new vision, individual and personal to the last degree, owing little to any school and making little of tradition. They are the great creators in Art, and it is to them that all later masters make their appeal, save Rembrandt perhaps, Velasquez as well as Rubens and Vandyck and Reynolds.

What, then, do we mean by “the Venetian school”? If all that is greatest in the Venetian painters is in each case a new and individual effort, owing little to tradition, the Venetian school might seem to be little more than a term without real significance. Yet, in fact, the Venetian school existed for more than two hundred years; only we find that here the term school means something different from what it does in the case of the Florentines, or the Sienese, or the Umbrians: something different, but not something less fundamental or less living.

By the Florentine school we mean essentially that long line of painters who worked on the lines Giotto had laid down, who extended them and secured them, but never departed from them; by the Sienese school we mean that line of painters who worked with the same intention and with the same effect as Duccio had worked and it is significant that when we come to such men as Sodoma, Girolamo di Benvenuto, Pacchia, and Pacchiarotto we no longer speak of them, Sienese though they be, as of the Sienese school, but confess at once that they have little or nothing to do with it.

In Venice it is different. There is nothing essentially of Florence in Florentine painting, there is nothing absolutely of Siena in Sienese work; but we have only to think of the work of the “Venetian school” to remember Venice. If, indeed, it is from Giotto that the school of Florence springs, if it is to Duccio that the Sienese painters owe the whole of their art, it is to Venice, and to Venice alone, that the Venetian painters look — it is she who has always prophesied of them, and without her they could never have existed at all. When we speak of the Venetian school, then, we mean, in a very precise way, the school of Venice — the painters which Venice produced or, at least, made essentially her own, all of whom were born within her dominion. This definition of what we mean by the Venetian school — the school which owes everything to Venice — alone unites such a master as Lorenzo Veneziano with Carpaccio and the Bellini, and truly connects them all with Giorgione, Titian, Tintoretto, and Paolo Veronese.

Nor is it in any sense far-fetched or even strained. For the commercial Republic of Venice was; one of the strongest and one of the most vital of the States of the world during many hundreds of years. It was not merely the greatest political power in Italy, but for very many years the greatest commercial power in the world, and, as we have seen, it depended not upon any balance of power in Italy, or even in Europe, but upon both Europe and the East, to which it was the key. Its political decadence sprang at last not from any internal cause, as in Florence or Siena, but from an external misfortune which it was incapable of preventing — the Fall of Constantinople in 1453. And since such were the conditions, the splendid conditions of its existence, it was capable of realizing a far more intense, a far richer and more energetic personality than any of the little Republics that, hovering between a despotism and a futile democracy, were able politically to distract Italy for so long, while in culture they achieved for us so much of what is most precious in our lives to-day. Their energies were divided, for their **civilization**[2] and their **culture** united at no single point. In Venice, on the contrary, civilization and culture went hand in hand, and thus when Venice expresses herself, whatever language she uses, we realize at once that we are face to face with a living personality at one with itself. It is to this personality we owe the Venetian School of Painting.

Precisely what I mean will become evident if for a moment we glance at the Republics of Florence and Venice as personalities. We shall then see at once that the great men of Florence were always greater than their city, whereas Venice was always greater than her greatest men. Florence was incapable of absorbing, often even of using, her greatest sons;

she sends Dante into exile, she cannot keep Leonardo, Michelangelo she fails either to understand or to comprehend, Galileo she allows to be imprisoned. Venice, on the contrary, lets not one of her sons escape, she is so profoundly living that she absorbs their energies and they enrich her. Marco Polo she both understands and honours, he dies in her arms; she absorbs the printers and paper-makers and becomes the printing press of Italy, even the poems of Lorenzo de' Medici are printed first at Venice. She alone of the Italian Republics is capable of producing great statesmen and politicians, but she absorbs them ; they are her servants and not her enemies. For centuries she faces the Church and keeps her liberty, like a nation ; and though the League of Cambrai at last destroyed her, she was able to meet it, and that even though she had received her death-blow long before when the treachery of Pío II overthrew Constantinople. What, then, we seem to see in Venice is a nation, the only nation in Italy, and this political and moral fact is decisive for her art, which is as national as the work of the English school of the eighteenth century.

But the Venetian school of painting is peculiar among the schools of Italy in something else beside its nationalism. It is civic rather than religious. By this I mean that it was rather the servant of the city and the citizens, of the State, in fact, than of the Church, and thus it became the first secular school of painting in Italy. There is nothing in all Venice, no series of frescoes or pictures which one may put beside the work of Giotto and his followers in S. Croce, of Ghirlandajo in S. Maria Novella. The pictures of Carpaccio in S. Giorgio degli Schiavoni were painted for the Dalmatians in the service of nationalism rather than in the service of religion. As for the mosaics of S. Mark's, they have nothing to do with the Venetian school of painting, are something, in fact, outside of it, and were made, after all, to decorate the chapel of the Doges. If we search for something to put beside the great fresco sequences of the Florentines, we shall find it, not in any church, but in the Doge's Palace, where at least three series of paintings have been destroyed and replaced by the splendid work wholly of national and civic significance which we see to-day. And it is the same throughout the city. Not the Church but the secular guilds, the Scuole commissioned and received series of paintings. It is not to the Franciscan Church of the Frari or the Dominican Church of SS. Giovanni e Paolo that we go in search of such things, but to the Scuola di S. Rocco and the Scuola di S. Maria della Carita, now the Academy, and, above all, to the Palace of the Doges. Neither the Scuola di S. Maria della Carita nor the Scuola di S. Rocco were Regular or even ecclesiastical communities, they were lay guilds and though the works they commissioned for the decoration of their guild houses are religious in subject, they are concerned rather with the guild and its intention than with religious teaching. Thus we see that the Venetian school of painting, wholly national in its inception, was altogether civic in its practice. The painters depended not upon the Church or the Religious Orders for their commissions, but upon the Government and the lay guilds of the people. So that in Venice we have the first great school of Italian painting which was in no way the servant of the Church.

That this great school was, in fact, to be a national school does not become evident till it was firmly established in the fifteenth century by the Bellini. The earliest work that passes under the name of Venetian, and that was largely done in the service of the Church, was for the most part the work of foreigners. This becomes evident at once if we examine the pictures collected in the Academy in their chronological order.

If Niccolo Semilicolo (1351-1400) is a Venetian one would not be convinced of it by his *Coronation of the Virgin* (23) or by the smaller works in that collection from his hand. He might seem to have no connexion at all with the work of the Bellini. If in the splendid work of Lorenzo Veneziano (1357- 1379) we seem to find something more national, especially in the beautiful ancona (20) of the Annunciation with saints and scenes from the Old Testament, which comes from the demolished Church of S. Antonio di Castello, he is but an isolated prophecy of the splendour that is to be, for in his work what we take to be Venetian

might seem rather to be Byzantine, and to owe more to Constantinople than to Venice. And if we think it strange that the Byzantine tradition should be still found in Venice on the eve of the fifteenth century, we must remember the geographical position of the city, and that nationalism, which was the secret of her being, had not yet been able to express itself. Yet in a very real sense the Byzantinism of Lorenzo is a blind, but nevertheless a certain, striving for that very thing. Of that we may be certain, for Giotto had long since been in Padua, and there his work remained. Yet Venice preferred what she had long ago made her own and still found in her own buildings and mosaics to Tuscan naturalism.

Nevertheless one may be sure that even in regard to Venice Giotto did not paint wholly in vain. We find his influence in the work of Altichiero of Padua, just as we find the influence of two other schools, the Umbrian in the work of Gentile da Fabriano and the German in the work of Johannes Alemannus, whom we call Giovanni da Murano, and it is these masters, in fact, who faintly and very far off influence, as far as any foreigners were able to do, the first painters of the national Venetian school.

Paduan work, and still better, work strongly influenced by the Paduans, is to be seen in the Academy; but it is in the beautiful altarpiece (625) of Antonio Vivarini and Giovanni da Murano that we find perhaps the finest work of these half-Venetian, half-foreign masters. There we see the Madonna enthroned with her Divine Child. Her expression is cold, even insipid, and yet pensive withal. The enclosed garden in which she sits reminds us of many an old German picture, but the whole is in some subtle fashion a prophecy of something warmer and more passionate than anything Germany will know how to produce, and the spell of Venice seems already to have fallen upon men who must have felt their fetters.

But it is in the work of Gentile da Fabriano, an Umbrian, that it seems to me Venice was most fortunate in the influence from without. In all the schools of Italy she could have found no more congenial prince to awake her. The painter of the glorious Adoration of the Shepherds in the Florence Academy might seem to have been a Venetian almost without knowing it, and his work in the Doge's Palace, where he was employed to paint the Sala del Maggior Consiglio, without doubt exercised the supreme influence upon the first master of the true Venetian school — I mean Jacopo Bellini — as well as upon such masters as Antonio da Negroponte and the later masters of the Murano school.

Jacopo Bellini was active between 1430 and 1470; he was Gentile's pupil, and came directly under the influence of one of the great masters of Northern Italy, Vittore Pisano of Verona, whom we call Pisanello. Pisanello worked at Venice in conjunction with Gentile da Fabriano, and these two painters may be said to have been the real founders of the Venetian school. For it is in the work of their pupils, and especially in the work of Jacopo Bellini and his pupils, that we find that school to have been established.

There remains in Venice, happily, more of the very rare work of Jacopo Bellini than anywhere else. In the Academy there is a *Madonna and Child* (582) which is rather disappointing, and in the Museo Civico (Sala IX, 42) a *Crucifixion*, while a doubtful S. Giovanni Crisogono on horseback remains in S. Trovaso. But if the Venetian character of Jacopo's work seems rather shadowy, we are assured of it at once in the great and plentiful work of his sons, Giovanni (1430-1516) and Gentile (1429-1507).

A whole room is devoted to the work of Giovanni Bellini in the Academy, and his work is plentiful in the Museo Civico and in the churches of the city. No one in looking upon it could mistake it for anything but Venetian; for though Giovanni was formed in Padua under the influence of Donatello, he was first his father's pupil, and it is probable that his greatest work was done for the Doge's Palace in his native city. What remains to us in the Academy is the six Madonna pictures and the five small allegories, and there is nothing in any one of them all that any but a master of the Venetian school could have painted. The work of his brother Gentile, who was also influenced by the Paduans, is rarer, though not in Venice. In the Academy we have four pictures: the first the picture of *Beato Lorenzo Giustiniani* (570),

painted in 1465 ; the second the wonderfully lovely *Corpus Christi Procession* in the Piazza (567), painted in 1496; the third the *Miracle of the True Cross* (508), painted in 1500; and the last the *Healing by the True Cross* (563), also a pageant picture. In such works as these we see how profoundly national the school was.

It is these men and their pupils who make up the school of Venice.

But here something must be said of a painter born, and as far as we know bred, in Southern Italy, who came to Venice in 1473, in the middle of the career of Giovanni Bellini. This painter was Antonello da Messina, and it was from him that, though we are unable to say how he acquired it, the Venetian painters learned to paint in oil. Only two of his works remain in Venice, an *Ecce Homo* in the Academy (589), and a *Portrait of a Man* in the Giovanelli Collection.

In contact with the Vivarini and Bellini his style developed; and though it perhaps may be unjust to say that he received as much as he gave, seeing that what he gave was a new means and material in painting, he certainly became a much finer painter, especially a portrait painter, than without Venice it seems likely he would have been. As a colourist, too, and this he would owe as much to that unknown Flemish painter whom we suppose to have been his first master as from the Venetians, he has had few equals, but it is chiefly as the introducer of painting in oils that he is significant in the Venetian school.

Among the most famous of his contemporaries, whom thus far at least were his disciples, are Vittore Carpaccio, who was working from 1478 to 1522, and was the pupil and follower of Gentile Bellini and Cima da Conegliano, who worked at the same time, and was the pupil of Alvise Vivarini and the disciple of Giovanni Bellini. The greater master of the two was Carpaccio, who in the many works by him that remain in Venice shows himself as an ideal painter of genre, which, when all is said, remains the true foundation of the Venetian school. We have seen the delightful work of Carpaccio in S. Giorgio degli Schiavoni in S. Giorgio Maggiore and in S. Vitale, two pictures by him are also to be found in the Museo Civico, but his most charming and delightful works are here in the Academy, where the Sala di S. Ursula and part of the old church of the Carita is surrounded by a series of large pictures from his hand concerning the story of S. Ursula, the Breton princess whose hand was sought by the son of the King of England, and who perished, with eleven thousand virgins, under the swords of the Huns at Cologne. Nothing, I suppose, in all Venetian art is more characteristic of it at its simplest than the *Dream of S. Ursula*, where we see a quiet room full of the cool morning light and all the simple furniture a maid would need, and there in bed lies S. Ursula asleep, dreaming of her prince and her pilgrimage to Rome. It is as though in Carpaccio's hands the most fantastic and improbable story of the Dark Age had become true, true to life and full of meaning, a sort of ideal reality which we shall search for in vain, I think, out of Venice. Of other works by the same master some are altogether lacking in this quality. We find it in the *Healing of a Madman* by the Rialto Bridge (566), painted in 1455; in the *Meeting of S. Joachim and S. Anna* (90), painted in 1515; and in the *Circumcision* (44) of 1510.

Cima, too, is well represented in Venice, for beside his works in the Carmine, in S. Giovanni in Bragora, in SS. Giovanni e Paolo, and in S. Maria dell' Orto, which we have already examined, there are six of his works in the Academy: a *Madonna and six saints* (36), *Tobias and the Angel with S. James and S. Nicholas* (592), a *Madonna and Child* (597), a *Madonna and Child with S. John and S. Paul* (603), a *Pieta* (604), and a *Christ with S. Thomas and S. Magnus* (611). Less original, perhaps, than Carpaccio, Cima is nevertheless one of the greatest of Giovanni's disciples. In him we see the other great characteristic of the Venetian school, for he is full of enthusiasm for landscape, the genre painting of out-of-doors, and in this he rivals his master. Over and over again he paints the hills of his birthplace, Conegliano, as though he loved them, and indeed with him landscape



painting became one of the secure and great achievements of the Venetian school.

We have said that he was the pupil of Luigi or Alvise Vivarini. This painter (1461-1503) was of the Murano school, but he came under the influence of Giovanni Bellini, and thus entered the true Venetian school of the fifteenth century. Many works by him remain up and down Venice, while in the Academy there are four pictures of saints — *S. Matthew* (619), *S. John* (618), *S. Sebastian*, *S. Anthony*, *S. John Baptist*, and *S. Laurence* (621), an early work, *S. Clare* (593), a *Head of Christ* (87), a later work, and a *Madonna and Child with six saints* (607) of 1480.

Thus we see the Venetian school of the fifteenth century with a common origin in the Bellini, and especially in Giovanni Bellini. For we have by no means named all the brilliant painters who passed through Giovanni's hands. We have yet to speak of Catena, a native of Treviso, whose first master was a painter of that city, Girolamo da Treviso by name. Catena, however, owes almost everything to Giovanni Bellini, in whose school he continued his education, coming later under the influence of Carpaccio, and later still under that of Giorgione.

Catena, who was active certainly from 1495-1531, but the date of whose birth is uncertain, was, in fact, one of the best pupils Giovanni Bellini ever had. His work is not plentiful in Venice, but what there is is chiefly early work; that, for instance, in the Palazzo Ducale, a *Madonna with two saints* and the *Doge Loredan*, a *Madonna with S. John Baptist* and another saint in Palazzo Giovanelli, a *S. Trinita* in *S. Simeone*, and a *Madonna and Child* in *S. Trovaso*. His work finds no place in the Academy. Vasari praises him for his portraits, but not one of these remains in Venice.

Another painter born at Treviso, Bissolo (1464-1528), was also a pupil of Giovanni Bellini, whom, in fact, he assisted in his work. He has not the brilliance of Catena, and is too often a disappointing pupil of his master. His work in Venice is fairly plentiful, and works by him exist in *S. Giovanni* in Bragora, in *S. Maria Mater Domini* in the Redentore, and in the Museo Civico, where is a *Madonna and Child with S. Peter Martyr*. The Academy possesses four of his paintings: a *Marriage of S. Catherine* (79), a *Pieta* (88), a *Presentation in the Temple* (93), and a *Madonna with S. James and Job*.

We find another follower of Bellini in Marco Basaiti, who was active from 1470 - 1527. He was probably a native of Friuli, and had passed through the hands of Alvise Vivarini. His work is somewhat hard and dry, yet often severe and full of dignity, but he cannot claim to be among the greater pupils of his great master. His work in the Academy consists of five pictures: a *Calling of the Sons of Zebedee* (39) and a *Christ in the Garden* (68), both painted in 1510, a *S. James and S. Antony* (68), a *Pieta* (108), *S. George and the Dragon* (102), painted in 1520, in which we discern Carpaccio's influence, and a *S. Jerome* (39).

Such were the best masters of the fifteenth century in Venice; and while all of them may be said to proceed from the studio of the Bellini, there is not one of them who does not show the profound influence of Venice herself. This influence, which makes the Venetian the one great national school of painting in Italy, comes to its own, and is emphasized in the great painters of the sixteenth century, the true glory of Venice. They too proceed from the school of Giovanni Bellini, and thus complete the direct descent of what is, when all is said, the greatest school of painting that has ever existed in the world.

And these painters of the sixteenth century in Venice express the fundamental origins of the school in all their strength. That school, as has been said, was never religious but rather civic in its origin, and it is in these heirs of the Bellini, the great pageant painters, that we realize that fact to the fullest extent. For with Giorgione (1478-1510), the pupil of Giovanni Bellini, who came under the influence of Carpaccio, we have a new creation in Art; he is the first painter of the true " easel picture," the picture which is neither painted for a church nor

to adorn a great public hall, but to hang on the wall of a room in a private house for the delight of the owner. For Giorgione the individual exists, and it is for him, for the most part, he works, and thus stands on the threshold of the modern world. Born in Castelfranco, a walled town of the Veneto not far from Bassano, not far from Treviso, Giorgione lived but thirty-two years, dying of plague, as it is said, in 1510. In these short thirty-two years, however, he found time to re-create Venetian painting, to return it to its origins, and to make the career of his great fellow-pupil, Titian, whom he may be said to have formed, possible.

And with the art of Titian all that was best, most fundamental, and implicit in Venetian painting came to flower. He sums up Venice, and is, in fact, to painting what Shakespeare is to literature, the greatest master of the modern world.

Of Giorgione's work, in its subtle and serene rhythm, in its perfect reconciliation of matter and form, musical, aspiring as Pater has so well said, "towards the condition of music," one supreme example remains in Venice — the Gipsy and the Soldier of the Palazzo Giovanelli. If the Apollo and Daphne of the Seminario be less fine, we must not fail to note what ravages time and the spoiler have worked upon it; while the Christ bearing the Cross at S. Rocco remains a lovely, if less characteristic, picture. In the Academy, unhappily, there is but a late work by this rare and delightful master, a *picture of a storm stilled by S. Mark* (516), which is his in part only, and which was finished by Paris Bordone. But in the Giovanelli and the Seminario pictures we have in Venice perfect examples of those "easel pictures" of which he was the creator — pictures which are concerned with a delightful out-of-doors and foresee so much of what is most delightful in true landscape painting, which are yet genre pictures of the best and most ideal kind, and which were painted for the delight of private persons, to bring light into a house and to make it home.

We owe to Giorgione in great part, too, the enormous vogue of the portrait that with him began to take the world by storm. His early Portrait of a Man, in Berlin, his Portrait of Antonio Brocardo, in Buda Pesth, his Knight of Malta, in the Uffizi, his Portrait of a Lady, in the Borghese Gallery in Rome are the great ensamples which Titian followed and at last perfected.

Of his actual pupils and scholars the most important was perhaps Sebastiano del Piombo (1485-1547), who had already passed through the hands of Giovanni Bellini and Cima, and was later to feel the influence of quite another master, Michelangelo. Probably the best example of his work under Giorgione's influence is afforded by his S. Chrysostom in S. Giovanni Crisostomo in Venice, but his work in S. Bartolommeo approaches it in beauty, and if the *Visitation of the Academy* (95) be really his, it is worthy of him at this period.

In Palma Vecchio (1480-1528) we have another painter, strongly influenced by Giorgione, who had passed through Giovanni Bellini's hands. He was probably not a Venetian, but he most truly became one, as his work in S. Maria Formosa is enough to testify, though, as Morelli says of him, he always kept about him something of the mountains where he was born. Three pictures from his hand are to be found in the Academy: *S. Peter Enthroned with six saints* (302), *Christ and the Woman Taken in Adultery* (310), and an *Assumption of the Virgin* (315), a later work. And with Sebastiano is to be named another master, a pupil of Alvise Vivarini, who later came under Giorgione's influence — I mean that delightful master, **Lorenzo Lotto (1480-1556)**. **Lotto nowadays owes almost all his reputation to the enthusiasm of Mr. Berenson**; unrepresented though he be in the Academy of Venice, we find his strangely moving work in the Carmine there, in S. Giacomo dell' Orio, and in SS. Giovanni e Paolo, and never without some thought, I suppose, of all that Venice had revealed to him of life, of life which continually demands a God.

Nor did later painters such as Bonifazio (1510-1540) and Pordenone (1483-1540) escape

the supreme influence of the great master. Bonifazio was a pupil of Palma Vecchio, but all that is really best in him he owes to Giorgione. His finest work in Venice is the Dives and Lazarus of the Academy (291), where also may be found a dramatic Massacre of the Innocents (319) from his hand, and a Judgment of Solomon (295), fine in feeling and rich in colour, which was painted in 1533, and is probably his only in part. As for Pordenone he was probably the pupil of Alvise Vivarini, but his art owes all that is good in it to Giorgione, as the works from his hand in the Academy — *a Portrait of a Lady* (305), *a Madonna and Child with saints and the Ottobon Family* (323), *S. Lorenzo Giustiniani and three other saints* (316), and *a Madonna of Carmel* (323) — testify.

But when all is said, when all Giorgione's pupils have been numbered and the men who in a later time came under his influence named, when even his own work, miraculous though it often seems and altogether beautiful and to be loved, is taken into account, Giorgione's greatest achievement was nevertheless the supreme and living work of Titian — of Titian who was his friend and who entered into his inheritance.

This is no place to begin a discussion of Titian's achievement, for that achievement is too wide and various and too generally understood and acknowledged for any words of mine to explain or to insure it. For most of us he remains the greatest painter our world has yet produced, and one of the most human and consoling.

Born in the town of Cadore in 1477, Titian came to Venice and entered the botttega of Giovanni Bellini, yet no work we possess certainly from his hand shows him to us at this period of his life. We meet him first as the disciple and friend of his fellow-pupil Giorgione, here in Venice, in the *Child Jesus with S. Catherine and S. Andrew of S. Marcuola*, and more especially in the earlier work in the sacristy of the Salute, *S. Mark Enthroned with four saints*. The Academy possesses four of his works, but they are all of a later period, the earliest, the great *Assumption*, dating from 1518. This vast altarpiece, painted for the High Altar of the Frari, may be said to be the first of Titian's works in his grand, assured style. Yet, seen as it is under a top light in the Academy, I have never been able to really to understand it or to love it as I might have done had I had the fortune to see it in that dim, vast church of the Friars, where Mary must surely have seemed indeed to soar out of the gloom of the earth into the light of Heaven, where He who is the Light of Light stretches His arms to receive her.

Another vast but more tender work, *the Presentation of the Virgin*, here in the Academy, was painted between 1534 and 1538 for the very hall it still occupies in the Scuola della Carita, which we now call the Accademia. Perhaps that is why we care for it so much; and though the general scheme of the work is traditional, we have only to remember what Titian makes of that small, awkward room — a very "street of palaces" — to realize something of his achievement.

The *S. John the Baptist* (314), a work of about 1550, from the Church of S. Maria Maggiore, shows us Titian's use, almost religious in its effect, of landscape, and just there we seem to come again to Giorgione; while in the *Pieta* (400) we have a work in his last wonderful manner, begun in 1573, two years before his death at the age of ninety-nine, and finished by Palma Giovane. Titian had painted this great and moving canvas for the tomb he wished to prepare for himself in the Cappella del Crocifisso in the Frari; but before it could be finished, he died of the plague. And under this last achievement of the mighty painter Palma wrote: "What Titian left unfinished, Palma has completed with reverence, and has dedicated the work to God."

Titian was the last of the true Venetian school; those who came after him, great painters though they were, were foreigners like Paolo Veronese, or eclectics like Tintoretto. Yet among the followers of Titian one disciple from Treviso must be named before we speak of these two painters, though he, too, fell later under the all-pervading influence of

Michelangelo.

Paris Bordone was born in Treviso in 1495, and died in 1570. He was absolutely Venetian by education, and owed everything to Titian, yet he took a line of his own, and his masterpiece, now in the Academy, the *Fisherman and the Doge* (320), an early work, fully justifies his fame, for it is one of the most interesting works in that collection, which also possesses his *Paradise* (322).

But the whole of the art of Venice after the death of Titian is, or seems to us to be, overshadowed by the heroic work, almost completely personal in its vision, of Jacopo Tintoretto, who was born in 1518, and was perhaps the pupil of Bonifazio, who passed in turn under the influence of Titian, of Parmigianino, and of Michelangelo, and yet always remained himself. It is, indeed, most characteristic of him that he is himself rather than Venetian. I do not mean that he was unmoved by his environment; far from it: he was always at the mercy of it; but he sought to express his own personal impressions of the world, of life, of Venetian life, rather than to be, as it were, the national voice, as Titian had certainly been with such a vast success. It is characteristic of him in his great spiritual egoism and strength that he was impatient of the art of Titian. The colour of Titian — yes, he cannot but accept that, but he proclaims that he will add to it the design of Michelangelo. In the attempt it seems to me he succeeded only in shadowing forth his discontent, in filling the sky with the light and darkness of his own soul, in thrusting upon man a task too large for him, insisting always that he is rather a demigod than a mortal, a demigod who is never at peace, who has despised small things, and is at home only in the midst of a vast battle of light and darkness in which Heaven, earth, and his own soul are continually involved. He has never understood how to be at peace. How differently Giorgione has regarded the world! For him the earth, the sky, and the life of man seem to pass into a strain of music; and for Titian, even in his latest period, all is to be understood and expressed by means of beauty or character. It is only Tintoretto who sacrifices everything for energy, and, as it were, by flashes of light and darkness would reveal to us man as a kind of force, tragic and restless and unhappy upon the distracted earth. Yet he painted the beautiful and noble works in the Ante Collegio of the Ducal Palace and in the year 1578.

But he was the child of an unfortunate age. The vast and invincible forces of disaster that threatened Italy and Venice, the cataclysm of the Reformation, the need of a new revelation in religion, appealed to him with a terrible and tragic fascination; before the bitter and overwhelming energy of life he was compelled to express himself and to cry out in the agony of his doubt concerning it. It is this appalling struggle, most of all with himself, with the fierce egoism of his own nature, that we see, I think, in so many of his works. The Church has been challenged, and so successfully that Christianity itself seems to be involved in the disaster. So he will insist on its everlasting certainty and truth, yes, for him himself, with an almost demonic energy and force. He will, like a prophet, call up that new revelation; and so in the Scuola di S. Rocco we see all we have loved no longer humble and poor, but overwhelming in its exaggeration. The humble and appealing figures of the Gospel story are revealed to us anew, heroic in size, filled with a terrible physical energy and strength, in an overwhelming shadow and light such as no man till then had so much as dreamed of, and all is contrived with so much actuality, so realistically, that we feel it to be unreal and even impossible. These figures with their immense torsos and limbs, their vast gestures, and pride, and strength, are Madonna, Christ and His disciples: — only we do not recognize them.

They fail in their appeal to us, they fail in beauty, not in energy or mastery or beautiful effects of painting, but in that beauty which is truth serene, which belongs to that perfect state which lieth in the heavens, seen there by Plato, and which S. Paul has told us is there eternal. Just this neither Titian nor Giorgione had ever willingly sacrificed, nor as I think, can any artist of any kind safely forget that it is an essential of our joy.

There are many pictures by Tintoretto in the Academy, and among them are several portraits — the *Portrait of Carlo Morosini* (242), the *Portrait of a Senator, a Senator in Prayer* (241), the *Portrait of Jacopo Soranzo* (245), painted in 1564, the *Portrait of Andrea Capello* (234), an early work, the *Portraits of two Senators* (244), and *again of two Senators* (240), and they are all of very great splendour, painted, it seems, with great swiftness and with a fine reserve. If then, when we remember Titian, these works seem less noble, and full of character though they be, to depend more upon their brilliance and a certain jewel-like quality, they are only less satisfying than those which are the greatest of all.

With Tintoretto Venetian painting became both personal and eclectic, so that we can no longer regard it as the work of a national school; in Paolo Veronese it became frankly foreign. Paolo of Verona, born in 1528, never came under the influence of any Venetian master in his youth, he accepted the Spanish invasion with a cheerfulness that recommended his art to the great international religious Orders, and Venice herself in his day seems to have put aside the fear that Tintoretto had so tragically expressed for her. At any rate, she accepted Paolo with delight. And seeing the riot of his pictures on the great coffered ceilings of the palaces and churches of the city to-day, who shall blame her? Her own art was dead; she herself was mortally wounded; only in such countrymen as the Bassanesi was any virtue left; so Paolo had his fling, and, like the great entertainer he was, he conjured up for her all her vanished pride and assured her she was still Queen of the Adriatic. And for the religious he contrived most cheerful scenes in Heaven full of mastery and delight, and with a richness and splendour that make them still among the brightest things in the world, and to which Tiepolo one day will know how to give a lightness and a laughter and indeed a life as of birds or seraphs on the wing.

[1] Edward Hutton (1911), “The Academy” in *Venice and Venetia*, New York, The Macmillan Company.

[2] By civilization I mean Industry, Economy, Politics. By culture I mean Philosophy, Religion, Ethics, and Art.

---

All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval system without a written permission from the editor.

Note: Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders. If any have been inadvertently overlooked the authors will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.

Updated on Apr 22, 2012 by [\[no name found\]](#) (Version 12)

## 06. Charles Borromeo on "The Church for Nuns and Female Monasteries", translated into English by Dr. Evelyn Carol Voelker

from Charles Borromeo (1577), *Instructiones fabricate et supellectilis ecclesiasticae*, Republished here as found translated at IN MEMORIAM by Dr. Evelyn Carol Voelker <http://evelynvoelker.com>

### Chapter 32

#### The church for nuns

Having described the form of other churches, we now follow with instructions regarding the church for nuns. This church may be built so as to consist of a nave only and it will face east if the site of the monastery permits. Its size should be in proportion to the site; it may have either a vaulted or coffered ceiling and as for the rest, it will be built as has been prescribed above.

#### *The high altar*

There shall not be a main chapel, but a transverse wall, which divides the innermost part of the church from the outer one where the priest celebrates mass. The altar should abut this transverse wall, at the center of the wall, and will correspond in height, length and width to the regulations given for a high altar.

There will be three steps leading up to the altar, including the footpace: each step will conform to the prescribed measurements and form. The footpace will conform to the criteria previously provided regarding the construction of the high altar.

#### *The window to be set above the high altar*

A window will be set into the transverse wall, in

view of the altar, from which the nuns can see and hear the Mass.

The window will be as wide as the altar and about two cubits high. The window ledge will be at least one cubit and ten ounces higher than the altar table. The window will have two similar iron grills, set about twelve ounces one from the other. The bars of each grill will be closely spaced, with no more than three ounces between them, and strongly joined together and set in so that they cannot easily be pulled out or separated. On the inside the window will have shutters, with bolt and key. These can be opened sideways, or be raised with a pulley and rope.

The altar can have an arch over it, making the wall thicker [at that point], or else by constructing two small columns or piers not far from the wall, on which to support the vaulted or arched opening. These small columns will be at a distance of two cubits from either end of the altar.

If there is no vault, the altar will have a wooden covering or a canopy of silk or fabric, appropriately decorated, called *capocoelium*.

***The window through which the sacred vestments are passed***

In the transverse wall between the inner and outer church, on the side of the nuns' sacristy, there will be an opening, with a rota through which the vestments needed for celebrating the Holy Mass may be passed.

The rota and the window will be about three cubits from the floor. The rota itself will be designed so that it will fit completely into the thickness of the wall, which in that point will be made thicker by applying extra plaster.

The window will be furnished with paired shutters on both sides, one set on the nuns' side and one on

the exterior. They will all be properly locked. The structure of the window and the rota will follow the prescriptions given below regarding the construction of the rotae in general.

***The small opening for administering Holy Communion***

On the other side of the altar, in the same transverse wall, there will be another small opening, decorated with pious sculpture and gilding, through which the nuns receive Communion. The window ledge will be flat and will be two cubits and sixteen ounces above the church floor. Outside the window will be one cubit, twelve ounces wide, and one cubit eighteen ounces high, [while inside it will be smaller, as explained below] so that, to the eye, it will appear wider outside, and narrower inside.

This aperture will exploit the entire thickness of the wall, one cubit deep, in such a way that inside on the nuns' side [with the sides of the opening slanting back], the wall will be no more than two or three ounces thick. In this part of the wall, one cubit square, the small window, eight ounces high, and six wide, through which the sacred Eucharist will be given to the nuns, will be opened.

On its inner side the small aperture will have well-made iron or bronze shutters, closed with a bolt and lock. On the outer side there will be somewhat larger shutters, which cover the entire opening, with lock, key and bolt.

On the church floor, directly under the small window, a small footstool will be set, eight ounces high, which can be covered with a carpet, for the priest to stand on while administering Holy Communion to the nuns. The footstool can be higher or lower, depending on the height of the priest.

On the inner side, where the nuns are, another footstool can be set, no less than two cubits per side, with a few steps leading up so that when the nuns kneel on it their mouths will be on a level with the small window through which they receive Holy



Communion. No board obstacles must protrude from the wall, so that the nun receiving the sacrament will more easily be able to come close to the small opening.

### ***The window for holy relics***

In addition, another opening will be set on the exterior part of the wall, above the small window through which the Holy Communion is received. The holy relics, if there are any, will be kept here rightly and in order. On the inside this window will be sixteen ounces high and twelve wide, with an iron grate and clear glass, covered with silk and closed by door valves, so that the holy relics can be seen but not touched.

On the outside, facing the outer church, it will be made so that it can accommodate the reliquary containers and vases. It will have solid door valves, with three locks and three bolts, to be closed with three keys each different from the other.

### ***The opening for the holy oil for the sick***

Above the rota opening, an ambry will be built, according to the prescribed rules, to keep the holy oil for the sick. This ambry will open only on the outer side, facing the church, and will be furnished with solid door valves, a lock and key. Whenever there are no other relics in the church, except for those in the altar, this ambry will be set over the small window through which Holy Communion is distributed.

### ***The altar steps***

At a distance of six cubits from the lowest step of the footpace of the altar, three other steps, or more depending on the site and as the architect advises, will be built leading down into the central part of the church where the floor will be somewhat lower than

where the altar stands. Iron railings will be set on the topmost step, as prescribed.

None of the steps are to be higher than eight ounces, or wider than twenty-four, and they will be built in a transverse direction to the church, or they will be as long as the opening in the iron railing.

### ***The sacristy***

A small sacristy will be built at the head of the church with an entrance within the confines of the railing. It will be used by the priest when removing his sacred vestments.

Care must be taken in building it so that there are no windows or rotæ or other openings of any kind from which anything can be seen or heard in the nuns' monastery. For this reason the lavabo, which will be built in the outer part of the sacristy for washing hands, should not have any pipes through which water can be received from inside the monastery, then to be emptied out elsewhere. There are moreover to be no structures of any kind above the sacristy to which the nuns can have access.

There will be an oratory and one altar for the priests to be used when they put on their vestments and a lavabo in the prescribed shape to wash their hands, which however is not to be set against the wall between the sacristy and the monastery. There will be a clothes press for storing the sacred vestments, and nothing else.

### ***The chapels***

There are to be two chapels in the body of the nuns' church, one on the right and the other on the left and in the form prescribed, so that should it be necessary, more than one Mass could be celebrated at the same time.

### ***The altar window***

Care must be taken that the window above the altar, equipped with iron grating, be made in such a way that it is not possible to see the public street, especially if public functions are held there or if crowds pass by. Therefore a small atrium will be built in front of the door of the church, with a side entrance, and not opposite the church door. Or, if this is not possible, the entrance to the church will be at the side, as the architect sees fit, depending on the characteristics of the site.

### ***The inner church***

The inner church will have a nave only, without chapels. The floor will all be on the same level, and not elevated by steps in any part. It will however be one or one and a half cubits lower than the floor on which the altar is located outside.

Great care must be taken that the inner church, which is the nuns' church, is not built near a public road. If the nature of the site makes this impossible, then there must be no windows on the wall facing the street, but light will come from the part adjacent to the monastery. It will be the opposite in the outer church, where the windows will open on the public street and not on the monastery.

### ***The bell tower***

The bell tower must be joined to the nuns' inner church. Neither the door, nor the windows, nor even a crack will face the outer church.

The height will be in proportion to the church, but lower than what the structure and shape demand.

The ground floor will have a very solid vault. Here, or on one side, there can be a narrow small door through which to climb, if necessary, to the top of the tower. There will be no other entrances elsewhere.

The holes for the bell ropes will be small, so that nothing but the draw-ropes can pass through. The small door will be very solid, closed with two bolts, two locks, two different keys. The other levels can be of wood and will receive light from narrow grated windows.

The top, however, will have windows as customary.

## **Chapter 33**

### **A monastery for nuns**

We shall now give some brief instructions regarding the monastery for nuns adjoining the church.

The site for building this monastery will be chosen in conformity with the Agathean directives, and will of course be removed from the monasteries of monks and buildings of the regular clergy, but also from the canonical and clerical edifices in general, from collegiate churches, towers, public walls, ramparts, outposts, earthworks, the citadel and particularly high buildings, any of which might allow a view into the monastery. Where possible, the monastery will not adjoin a secular building, but will have an intervening space.

It will be far from piazzas, markets, shops, roads, where there is traffic of beasts of burden, wagons, vehicles of various kinds, as well as away from places where crowds come together, gather and where there is great clamor.

Again care should be taken not to locate the monastery in a secret obscure place, far from human contact. Neither should it be situated outside the city walls, or those of the town and the area in general, decreed unsuitable to the nuns' monastery by the Council of Trent.

The places of the monastery, to be described individually and in detail below, according to their function, are as follows, beginning with those on the ground floor:

Small chapter room [*atriolum*]

Dining room, called “refectorium”

Wine cellar

Kitchen

Calefactory [warming room:hypocaust]

Washroom

Workroom

Portico

Interior and exterior parlors

Doors

Rotae

Bakehouse

Laundry

Tonsorium

Administrative offices

Food dispensary

Pharmacy

Places on the upper floor

Dormitory hall or dormitory cells

Novitiate school

Wardrobe

Granary

Separate places

Infirmary

School for young girls

Kitchen garden and garden

Prison and place of retreat

Interior and exterior place for Confession

Temporary exterior lodgings for outside laborers

Temporary lodgings for the priest-confessor

### ***Small chapter room***

The size of the room in which the nuns' chapter meetings take place should be in

proportion to the number of nuns, and should have benches on all sides.

It should not be oblong or narrow in form, but as square as possible, so that any exhortation or admonition that the superior may give can be readily heard everywhere. The lighting in the chapter room should be dim rather than bright and the room should be decorated with some kind of painting, especially in the part where the superior's chair is located, meant to arouse pious feelings.

### ***Refectory and wine cellar***

The dining room, called refectory, should be in the location most convenient to the other parts of the monastery. It will be large enough so that not only all the nuns residing in the monastery at the time can be comfortably seated along the walls, but also those who are likely to be received into the monastery in the future, depending on its size and resources.

It will have at the head a decoration of sacred images, appropriately and piously painted. At the center of one of the side walls there will be a pulpit, from which spiritual reading can be distinctly heard everywhere. There will be windows on both sides to provide light. The wine cellar will be built below the refectory, and will also have windows set at regular intervals.

Another area should be set close both to the

refectory and the wine cellar, so that the person responsible for the wine cellar will have a place to store bottles, earthenware vessels and other recipients for water and wine. Or, if possible, a small courtyard with a well can serve the same purpose.

### ***Kitchen***

The kitchen should be located as close as possible to the refectory so that the dishes can be handed through a window or a small passageway in-between to the nuns who serve in the refectory. The kitchen will be spacious and with a fireplace in proportion to its size, and a small stove where the food can be cooked.

The following rooms should be annexed to the kitchen: a small room for apportioning cooked foods; a small room to be used as pantry for daily food and provisions; a place for washing dishes, pots and food utensils; a courtyard with a well, separated from the rest; if movable wooden pipes are already being used to bring in water, then pipes of lead or wood, or of some other kind, can be fitted on to direct the water, when needed, to the washroom and the kitchen.

There should be another similar yard for chickens.

### ***Washroom***

The place with the vessel or water basin where the nuns gather to wash their hands before the tables are blessed, must be built not far from the refectory and the chapter hall, and in size will be proportionate to the number of nuns.

Here the washbowl, in marble, bronze or some other material, attached to the wall, will have as many spouts as the length requires. Underneath there will be a concave sloping drain, along which the water will flow elsewhere when it leaves the basin through holes.

### ***Calefactory***

The calefactory or warming room, which is called “hypocaustum”, is a room with a fireplace where the nuns can gather around the fire in winter to warm themselves. It can be built near the refectory and the washroom, and will be large enough to hold all the nuns. It will have a wide fireplace which can be built facing any direction whatsoever, or set against the wall, or built in the wall of the room, so that one can warm oneself wherever one is.

### ***Workroom***

The workroom in which the nuns gather at certain hours for handwork should be well lighted, without areas in the half-light. The light required for the work, either weaving, or embroidery or sewing, will come from all sides. It will moreover be spacious, and built so as to be as full of light as possible.

### ***Porticoes***

The porticoes will be simple, that is consisting of a simple order of columns or small piers, and unostentatious in structure rather than magnificent and sumptuous. These porticoes will be built in the form of a square.

Like the other places described above, they can have a coffered ceiling or some other wooden covering. However for durability, as well as precaution against fire, they should preferably be vaulted.

### ***Cells for conversations***

The cells for conversations [or parlatorium], both inner and outer, should be built in a place that is not



remote and hidden, but in plain sight and close to the door of the monastery reception room.

The windows in the inner parlatorium will receive light from the interior of the monastery; those of the external parlatorium from the part facing outwards. Except for the window or windows specifically made for the conversations [locutory windows], care will also be taken that there be no other aperture between one parlatorium and the other.

### ***Locutory windows***

The locutory window will have a double iron grating, with a space of about twelve ounces between them. The grating will have firmly fixed bars set no more than three ounces apart.

There will also be a sheet of iron, not much wider than the window on all sides, which will be attached to the wall on the inner side, that of the monastery, and sealed with pitch, so that it touches the grating on the inside. It will contain numerous holes the size of a chickpea, about three ounces apart.

At the center there will be a small square window, measuring sixteen ounces square, closed with bolt, lock, and key.

On the inside the window will then be covered by a black cloth, stretched on a frame that can be opened.

In these monasteries where the rule in force is that the nuns shall in no way be seen from the locutory window, it will have a simple iron grating, will be covered with iron sheeting without the small window, and it will not be possible to open the cloth frame.

Wherever, because of the number of nuns, two, three, or more windows are required, they should be built in a single place or cell, if convenient, in the prescribed manner, but so that they are set in an orderly row, four or five cubits apart from each

other. They can also be separated by partitions, as long as these have a window or opening from which every nun who is having a conversation can be seen by the others who are speaking at the other windows.

Nor shall a rotating turn [rota] be set up in any place for conversation except in one place, in an opening built specifically for that purpose.

### ***Doors [Entrance doorways]***

As is logical, only two doorways will be built in the monastery. One, called the reception door, will be for normal use, the other for beasts of burden, wagons and vehicles.

The reception doorway will be located in a place that is neither dark nor hidden, but will be clearly visible and convenient for all parts of the monastery. It will not be large and will have solid door valves, with two layers of planks. It will be closed by two bars or double bolts and locks with different keys. A small door will be set into the door valves. It will also be furnished with strong door panels, double bolts and locks with different keys, so that there is no need to open the large door for minor reasons.

In the door valves there will be a wicket, round or square, or of some other shape, but no larger than five or six ounces on all sides. It will have an iron sheet with tiny holes, no larger than a millet seed. Inside it will be covered by a thick cloth or a thin panel, which can be turned when looking out.

This door must be placed in such a manner that, when opened, the nuns inside cannot see the public street, with the view closed off by an intervening vestibule. Or the door will be opened at one side, and the view will not be directly into the monastery, but of a wall near the vestibule. The doorsill will be of marble or solid stone, and closely fitted to the door itself.

There will be solid jambs, tightly fitted to the door valves all along the sides, on either side of the door.

The various parts both of the door and of the small door must be compact and well joined so as not to leave even the smallest crack.

A small room should be constructed near the door, where the [doorkeeper nuns]

portresses can do their work and are ready to answer those who knock. There will also be a rota nearby, which opens into the portresses' cell or not far off.

The second or carriage doorway, should be built in a clearly visible place, and will be large enough to allow vehicles, carts and wagons to enter. It will have a stone or marble sill, as above, so that not even the smallest object can pass through. There should be no small door. It will be furnished with door valves, sturdy bars, double keys, of different kinds, like the others. Moreover there can be two sets of door valves, one inside on the side of the nuns, the other outside, on the public way. This doorway will be constructed in a part of the monastery convenient for access to the woodshed and the coal cellar, used for the kitchen, and the wine storeroom. Four or five cubits from this doorway, inside the monastery, there will be a gate of oak planks or of some other solid material, about three ounces apart. This gate should be as high as the top of the door and securely locked with bars, locks and keys.

### ***Rotae***

The rota, which is placed in the church, or near the door, or in another prescribed place, will be either of bronze or of wood, in which case it will be carefully lined with sheets known as "*de tola*" [Milanese dialect for tin]. It will be one cubit and eight ounces high, and one cubit wide, but at the opening it must be no wider than sixteen ounces. It will all be well joined and solid, so that in no place will there be a fissure, however small, through which one could look outside.

#### 1. [1 Chapter 32](#)

1. [1.1 The church for nuns](#)
2. [1.2 The high altar](#)
3. [1.3 The window to be set above the high altar](#)
4. [1.4 The window through which the sacred vestments are passed](#)
5. [1.5 The small opening for administering Holy Communion](#)
6. [1.6 The window for holy relics](#)
7. [1.7 The opening for the holy oil for the sick](#)
8. [1.8 The altar steps](#)
9. [1.9 The sacristy](#)
10. [1.10 The chapels](#)
11. [1.11 The altar window](#)
12. [1.12 The inner church](#)
13. [1.13 The bell tower](#)

Inside, on the monastery side, it will have an iron hook or a small firmly attached bolt, to close it. It must not be possible to turn it from the outside, unless the nuns inside have released it. On the inside it will be closed with solid panels, bar, lock and key.

### ***Bakehouse***

The bakehouse will be built as far as possible from the dormitory and the wardrobe, to avoid danger of fire.

The flour storage will be built nearby, in a higher or lower place, or in some other convenient site. A storeroom for screens, sieves and other equipment needed in processing flour will also be built, unless the storeroom can easily contain them. There will also be a third room where the bread will be made, where in other words the dough is mixed and left to rise: this will be well closed on all sides. Annexed will be a well and a small oven with a cauldron.

In the front part of the oven there will be an opening a cubit in size through which the live charcoals and embers are thrown into the ditch built under the vault of the oven itself.

In the upper part of the oven there will be a small *vaporarium*, known in the vernacular as “*la stufetta*”, which could be used for various purposes.

In building the bakehouse the site where dry wood and other materials for lighting the fire are kept must be kept in mind.

### ***Laundry***

The laundry must be close to the garden or vegetable gardens in order to spread the washed wet laundry in an open sunny place. If there are no gardens, a raised structure will be prepared, access

## **2. Chapter 33**

1. [2.1 A monastery for nuns](#)
2. [2.2 Small chapter room](#)
3. [2.3 Refectory and wine cellar](#)
4. [2.4 Kitchen](#)
5. [2.5 Washroom](#)
6. [2.6 Calefactory](#)
7. [2.7 Workroom](#)
8. [2.8 Porticoes](#)
9. [2.9 Cells for conversations](#)
10. [2.10 Locutory windows](#)
11. [2.11 Doors \[Entrance doorways\]](#)
12. [2.12 Rotae](#)
13. [2.13 Bakehouse](#)
14. [2.14 Laundry](#)
15. [2.15 The place for washing hair \[tonsorium\]](#)
16. [2.16 Administrative office](#)
17. [2.17 Food dispensary](#)
18. [2.18 Pharmacy](#)
19. [2.19 The upper quarters of the monastery: first, the cubicle hall or dormitory](#)
20. [2.20 Latrines](#)
21. [2.21 Site of the novitiate school](#)
22. [2.22 Wardrobe](#)
23. [2.23 Granaries](#)
24. [2.24 Infirmary](#)
25. [2.25 Site for the education of young girls](#)
26. [2.26 Monastery gardens](#)
27. [2.27 Prison and place of retreat](#)
28. [2.28 The place to hear the Holy Confession](#)
29. [2.29 Confessor's lodgings](#)
30. [2.30 External lodgings for servants and temporary farm help](#)
31. [2.31 Living quarters of the lay sisters](#)
32. [2.32 A few precautions to keep in mind in building the monastery in general](#)

to which is by steps, with a suspended "portico" [porch, Lat. porticus pensiles] at the top with upright and transversal rods or poles, from which the garments, blankets, linen, bed linen etc. can be hung to dry in the sun.

This structure will have a good exposure, but will be low enough so that it is impossible to see outside the boundaries of the monastery. If there is no room to build the laundry on the ground floor of the monastery, it can easily be located beneath it.

The laundry will be fairly large, with a floor in brick or some other material. There will be a well, from which to draw water by means of a pulley, that is a type of wheel for drawing water known as "*la tromba*". There will also be stone basins for water, and small ovens with cauldrons [*furnulos clibanosve cum ahenis*]

A deep capacious ditch will be dug beneath this site, into which the water spill will flow. The coal cellar from which the fuel is taken to heat the cauldrons must also be nearby.

### ***The place for washing hair [tonsorium]***

It will be convenient to place a room where the nuns can wash their hair, the *couriceum* or *tonsorium*, near the laundry. In it there will be a fireplace, a small stove, a cauldron on the stove to make lye and a receptacle for the dirty water.

### ***Administrative office***

A highly convenient and luminous place in the monastery should be chosen for the administrative office. The nuns' superiors will gather here in a well-built room to examine or conduct the affairs of the monastery.

A wooden structure subdivided into cabinets and bookshelves, all specifically labeled, will be placed

around all the walls of the room to keep in good order the monastic account books, first drafts, records of assets and debits, archives, documents and public deeds pertaining to the monastic rights, as well as coffers for money and other objects of the kind.

The room will be closed with two keys, the same number of locks, two bolts and extremely solid double doors.

### ***Food dispensary***

We have already spoken about the pantry set aside for daily food. But instructions are also required regarding the food storeroom where the yearly provisions of wheat, pulses, oil and other edible supplies are kept and from which they are taken as needed.

This storeroom should be built in an isolated site; it will be thoroughly covered with stucco or plaster, so that there is not the slightest crack anywhere through which rats or mice might get in.

The room will have boxes, bins, baskets and all kinds of containers, each in its own place. It will be closed with a double lock and two different keys.

### ***Pharmacy***

The monastery may have a pharmacy for its own use. Even though not all kinds of medicine will be found here, those simple remedies, easy to prepare and which serve to cure or alleviate sudden attacks of illness, should be kept here.

The pharmacy should be located as far as possible from the church, the workplace, and in general from all parts of the monastery which should not be

bothered by noise. The many mortars in a pharmacy, where herbs are pounded and medications are prepared, together with the frequent conversations, make it anything but silent.

The pharmacy must not be too hot, but rather cool.

Inside it will be divided by vertical partitions, either set into or attached to the walls, and separated from each other by a fixed space, between which horizontal shelves, resting on solid supports will be set. All the apothecary jars will be arranged in order on them and in certain repositories.

Annexed to the workroom will be a small room where the distilled water and other jars with ointments or medications are kept. This small room will supplement the storage space of the workroom if need be. There will be another cool room in which the herbs and distillation jars are kept, as well as a bit of charcoal. A fireplace will be built in one of these rooms.

There will also be a small basin from which water will flow into a ditch below.

It would be very useful for the pharmacy if it could have a courtyard and well of its own. Otherwise it can be built near a well.

Thus far we have discussed the lower parts of the monastery. We will now move on to the upper parts.

***The upper quarters of the monastery: first, the cubicle hall or dormitory***

At the beginning we listed the upper parts of the monastery. Among these, the most careful attention and thought is to be given to the cubicle hall, known as the “dormitory”.

One of the first things to consider in choosing the site is that it is not subject to unhealthy air. It should

face a direction where, depending on the climate, the air is not heavy or thick, and there is no wind to the contrary.

The site must not be subject to any servitude, as might be the case if one could see inside from some outer part, or if a wall or outside building obstructed light to the monastery windows. Nor should it be possible to look outside from any part of the dormitory.

In line with the criteria followed in building the lower part and the number of nuns, there will be three or four dormitories, one on each side of the cloister. The width and length of each dormitory will depend on the size of the floor below.

At either end of the dormitory light will be let in by rather large windows, six or seven cubits from the floor. These windows will be firmly barred and have clear glass, but in such a way that the upper part can sometimes be opened to allow air to circulate. Should there be need of a small window or two on the long sides of the dormitory, they will be put in only on the part overlooking the cloister.

Each dormitory will be subdivided into small cells, each five or six cubits square, and separated from the others by thickly woven mats or stretched lengths of fabric or curtains.

However if the dormitories are not common halls (as the ancient institutions seem to indicate) and real cubicles, separate and distinct, are built, they should be systematically arranged on both sides of a central passageway and if possible form a square. They will not be spacious, but about seven cubits per side, just large enough to contain a cot. They will be simply and humbly constructed, without any painted decoration.

Each one will have only one small window, and a small door, which will not close with a lock and bolt, but with a type of latch, known [in Italy] as an "*alzapiede*" or droplatch, attached to the door so it can easily be opened from outside by pulling a



string. There will be no fireplace of any sort.

Should it be necessary to build these cells much larger, every precaution should be taken so that there will be enough space for at least three, or more, beds, as the superiors should deem fit, but never only two.

Caution should also be taken that no windows are built from which one can look out beyond the monastery limits.

If it is necessary to have a window in a cell, or in some other higher place, from which one might look out over the vegetable gardens, or the neighboring places, then the window will have the most solid iron grating everywhere. Outside, at a distance of one and a half cubits, a transenna, a marble or sheet-iron barrier, with holes one ounce apart, will completely cover the window and be solidly set into the wall.

But for no reason whatsoever is a window, regardless of size, to be opened overlooking the public way in either the lower parts, or in the upper parts of the monastery.

The dormitory halls, whether they are common quarters or divided into individual cells, are to be built so that they can only be reached by one staircase, or at the most two. Once the doors and entrances of the monastery are closed there will then be no other entrance or possible way to enter or ascend to these halls.

### ***Latrines***

The latrines should be erected in a place separated from but near the dormitory. They should have a certain kind of seat and each one, separated from the others by a partition, will consist of a small space in which the nun can go without being seen by

others. The entire latrine area must not only be enclosed, but also without cracks, so that nothing can be seen, and it cannot emit foul odors.

### ***Site of the novitiate school***

The novitiate or schoolroom where the novices live should be built in a location separated from those places frequented by the professed nuns. The site should be spacious and situated so that it receives good air. It will be enclosed, with its latrines and all other facilities suitable for its functions.

### ***Wardrobe***

The communal wardrobe will be built in a sunny airy place, with windows on both sides. Only woolen garments will be kept here.

All around it will have wardrobes five or six cubits high, carefully arranged and

separated, each with compartments that are as high as the nuns' habits are long.

There will be an open longitudinal porch outside the wardrobe door. Iron brackets will be attached to the wall, outside, not too close to each other. Poles or rods will be placed across them so that clothes can be hung up and beaten at specific times.

A room for keeping linen garments and all the linens must be annexed to the wardrobe, unless there is enough space in the wardrobe to contain the linen chests and wardrobes, separated from the rest.

However, if possible, it is best to have this room separate from the wardrobe.

There must then be a third room, also with wardrobes on all sides, in which blankets, mattresses, and other furnishings of the kind, and the

fur garments, arranged in orderly fashion and separated, are to be kept. This room however will be built in a cold rather than a sunny site.

### ***Granaries***

The granaries will be built near the [monastery] door. The stairs leading to them will be clearly visible, and with strong doors, each of which closed with a double key, lock and bolt.

### ***Infirmary***

After having described the lower and upper parts of the monastery, still to be dealt with are the places and living quarters which must in some way be kept separate from the monastery. First of all we will discuss the infirmary.

The infirmary, that is the place where the sick or convalescent nuns are cared for, should not be built inside the monastery, but a bit further from the door of the reception room. The site must above all be healthful.

The infirmary will consist of lower and upper parts. There will be a dining room about twenty cubits long, and proportionately wide, a kitchen, a pantry, a laundry, a courtyard with its own well, a woodshed, a portico, two or three cells on the lower level, of medium size, which contain each three beds, and have a fireplace, either one apiece or one shared by two rooms. In the upper level there will be four or six moderately large cells, also with a fireplace and separate latrines, as described above.

If there is room for a small garden for the infirmary, it would be well to have one. The enclosure, with only one entrance, will be closed by a single door.

### ***Site for the education of young girls***

In monasteries where it is permitted to educate young girls, under the custody of the nuns, living quarters will be constructed for them where they can live separately from the nuns. Every structure will be separate, except for the church. The living quarters will consist of the following parts: a small hall with fireplace, a pantry, a courtyard with well and a small portico, a woodshed, two cubicles on the lower floor; in the upper part, one or more rather large dormitories, each containing at least three or four beds, or more, but no fewer. There will be only one door to the building. Where possible it will be useful to have a garden.

### *Monastery gardens*

The nuns' vegetable gardens must not be extensive because of the many risks of violating the clausura. Since large tracts cannot be easily surrounded by walls the following should be done: that on the side of the monastery where there would be an opening and view for the general public, a space of one hundred cubits or a bit more on each side will be enclosed all around by walls one cubit and eight ounces thick and no less than sixteen cubits high, calculated from the ground up.

It shall not be desirable to exceed the above allotted space of one hundred cubits square, even if the gardens can be easily enclosed, since they would be too large to be cultivated by the nuns or the resident lay sisters and it would be necessary, against the rules of clausura, to bring in farmhands or workers from outside to cultivate and plant.

No cuttings or other plants, vines, or trees of any kind are to be planted inside, close to the walls, nor outside, unless they are at least six cubits distant. No large trees are to be planted in this plot of land at the back [of the garden] but rather low sparse bushes. No woodpiles or straw or haystacks are to be made. No shed, nor hut, even the tiniest, is to be built.

The ground will not be used for growing hay or as a

meadow, but only vegetables, medicinal and kitchen herbs are to be grown and nothing that is not essential.

If water runs through the garden in a ditch or a channel, caution must be taken that this conduit is well covered with stone or cement for a distance of about six cubits from the place where the water flows into the garden, calculating both outside and inside. The opening through which the water enters at the beginning of the stone or masonry covering, and the other opening at the end of the covering, where the water goes out, will be furnished with iron gratings on both sides. The same will be done at the other end of the garden where the water flows out.

The conduit itself can be made without grates if it is covered for the entire length of the garden property through which the water flows. If it is necessary to channel the water either for irrigating the gardens or for the laundry, this can be deviated wherever needed through small holes, and then be rechanneled to the conduit.

### ***Prison and place of retreat***

Monasteries should have, as they once did, a strong prison in which to incarcerate any nun, depending on how serious the offence is, who has strayed from discipline and behaved badly.

The prison will be far from the public road and likewise from neighboring buildings, and should more specifically be located on the inside of the upper floor of the monastery, remote from the places where the nuns go and gather.

It will be secure and well-built of timber with a solid vault and have a small window one cubit square with strong bars, high up on the wall, through which a little light comes in. It will have a small entrance with two sets of doors. There will be a tiny window in the upper door, closed with a double lock and double bolts. It will also have shackles, as suggested in the old rules, and iron manacles, to chain the imprisoned nuns if need be.

The prison will have no fireplace, and no opening except for a latrine, with narrow pipes. The place of retreat will be not far from the prison and will be freer and more comfortable than the latter. Here the nuns, separated from the others, will occasionally do salutary penance for lesser sins.

### ***The place to hear the Holy Confession***

So far we have described the parts of the monastery. Now we will deal with the adjoining places. First of all care must be given to the place where the nuns go to confession.

This place, at a short distance from the church, will have a second room, adjacent on the outside, where the priest confessor can hear their confessions.

The inner room, where the nuns confess, will be on the ground floor so that there will be no need of a staircase, and it will have a good floor or a vault below, so as to prevent cold or humidity. It will be far from noise of any kind and built in all its parts so that the nuns cannot be heard by anyone except the priest confessor. The room should be about six or seven cubits square.

The priest's cell, equal in size and form, will be built adjoining [the above room], on the outside.

In the wall that is common to both these rooms or cells used for confession there will be a small window a cubit high at the most and about sixteen ounces wide, in proportion to the height. There must be no way in which this small window, well equipped with iron grates and an iron plate with tiny holes, and a black cloth fastened over it, can be opened.

In the same wall there can be a rota, half the size of the others described above. to pass the priest what he needs. This rota will be solid and well built, as prescribed for the other rotae.

### ***Confessor's lodgings***

Lodgings will also be built, located between the outer door, which opens onto the public street, and the inner door, which opens onto the cloisters. They will consist of two rooms, one below and one above.

The priest can use these lodgings when he needs to stay overnight so that he will be ready to administer the sacraments to any nun who may be seriously ill. These lodgings will have a fireplace, a latrine, and whatever is needed, but no rota, and no window from which one can look or converse with any pretext whatsoever. He will have no other rooms except these two, to keep at bay any occasion for conversation or contact, and no other additional space, however small.

This way there will be fewer, or no, occasions and conveniences to stay there, unless absolutely necessary.

These criteria are also to be followed in building the lodgings below.

### ***External lodgings for servants and temporary farm help***

Lodgings for the temporary farm help and the nuns' servants will be built in the same intermediate space.

These lodgings will have two or three cubicles, but no rota or locutory opening. It would not be a bad idea if these lodgings could be somewhat at a distance from the monastic building, so that not even the roofs would touch.

### ***Living quarters of the lay sisters***

The criteria to be followed in building the living quarters for unprofessed lay sisters, located beyond the cloistered confines, is that they open and close towards the inside, that is on the side of the nuns. In order to do this it might be useful to follow the recommendations below.

In the same intermediate place outside the cloister confines, living quarters will be built to accommodate as many lay sisters as the monastery will probably need. These living quarters will have all the indispensable parts, that is a common dormitory, kitchen, well, woodshed, and other useful and appropriate places. But care should be taken in building the living quarters not to have any window in the exterior wall, which overlooks the public road, nor any hole or smallest crevice. There is to be only one doorway, built near the monastery enclosure wall, wherever it may be.

In the enclosure wall there will be a hole of about six ounces through which a wooden bolt (pole) of the same thickness (as the wall) will be passed. Pushed across and inserted into the opposite wall for a short distance, it will securely close the doors of the entrance.

At the other end of this bolt (pole), which is on the nuns' side, there will be a key with a lock that can easily be opened and closed by the nuns inside.

If it is impossible to use the transversal pole to close the door, it will be easy to use a bolt that is perpendicular, rather than transversal, to the door opposite the hole, resting on the top of the valves, and closing them tightly.

In these dwelling quarters, on the monastery side, there will be a small window, no larger than five or six ounces, equipped with a sheet of iron with tiny holes, from which the superior can call the lay sisters and check to see that they are inside when the door is closed. And from here the lay sisters, when they are preparing to go out, will ask for her blessing and permission.

***A few precautions to keep in mind in building the monastery in general***



Above all, in building the monastery extreme care should be given to the enclosure, so that the entire site wherever it may be, whatever its size, be enclosed on every side with proper and solidly built walls.

They will be at least twenty-four cubits high, except for the garden walls, for which measurements have been given above. They will be a cubit or somewhat more thick, but not less.

The outer walls will have no chimneys set into them but they are not forbidden on the inner walls, projecting from the surface. There will moreover be no windows, or small windows, or cracks, or fissures through which the slightest glimpse could be had.

In building the individual parts of the monastery which serve the entire community, such as the refectory, the chapter room, the infirmary, the dormitory, the calefactory, the place for washing hands, the workroom and others, but above all the interior of the church, it is important not to disregard, but to be particularly careful that all these places, in which the nuns generally gather in goodly number, are spacious enough to comfortably accommodate not only all the nuns already there, but all those who are likely later on to be received in the monastery, in view of the quantity and the accession of resources and charitable endowments.

But the greatest precaution of all to be taken is that in no outer locutory room, in no lodgings of the priest confessor or of the temporary farm workers and servants, in no external part of the monastery, in no building constructed externally should there be an upper room, to which the nuns have access. Nor should there be any higher room in the inner parts to which outsiders have access, for any reason whatsoever.

Care must also be taken that all the entrances, vestibules, narrow passages and places of this kind to be found in the monastery are brightly lit and visible, and are not dark or in the half-light.

Lastly, there will be a holy picture, piously depicted

in every part or corner, entranceway, staircase, and  
in the reception room of the monastery.

---

All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval system without a written permission from the editor.

Note: Every effort has been made to contact copyright holders. If any have been inadvertently overlooked the authors will be pleased to make the necessary arrangements at the first opportunity.

Updated on Απρ 22, 2012 by [\[no name found\]](#) (Version 13)

## 07. Books received

Reviews are welcome from the books below.

(Alphabetically listing)

**Bewer, Francesca G.** (2010), *A Laboratory for Art: Harvard's Fogg Museum and the Emergence of Conservation in America, 1900–1950*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Art Museums (ISBN 978-1-891771-53-8).

**Davis, Whitney** (2010), *A General Theory of Visual Culture*, Princeton, New Jersey and Woodstock, Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press (ISBN: 978-0-691-14765-9).

**Harris, Jonathan** (2001), *The New Art History, A Critical Introduction*, London & New York: Routledge (ISBN: 978-0-415-23008-7).

**Horowitz, Noah** (2010), *Art of the Deal: Contemporary Art in a Global Financial Market*, Princeton, New Jersey and Woodstock, Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press (ISBN: 978-0-691-14832-8).

**Iatrou, Maria** (2011), *The double of the dead brother. Intertextual notes over a theme in "Who was the murderer ..." of G.M. Vizyinos*, Thessaloniki: Nisides. [**Ιατρού, Μαρία** (2011), *Ο σωσίας του νεκρού αδελφού. Διακειμενικές σημειώσεις για ένα θέμα στο «Ποιος ήταν ο φονεύς..» του Γ.Μ. Βιζυηνού*, Θεσσαλονίκη: Νησίδες.] (ISBN 978-960-9488-11-2).

**Weingarden, Lauren S.** (2009), *Louis H. Sullivan and a 19th-Century Poetics of Naturalized Architecture*, London, UK: Ashgate Publishing Co. (ISBN: 978-0-7546-6308-9).

**Zchomelidse, Nino and Freni, Giovanni**, eds (2011), *Meaning in Motion: The Semantics of Movement in Medieval Art*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press (ISBN: 978-0-691-15193-9).